

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE third volume has been published of THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. Its first article is 'Burial,' its last article 'Confessions.' Between these articles lie some of the most important topics in all the study of Religion, and especially in the preaching of the Gospel of Christ.

The student of the Apocalypse is at sea if he knows not what 'Caesarism' means. For in that book it is not Rome that is the enemy, but the worship of Rome; it is not Nero the man that is the Beast (though Nero was vile enough as a man), it is Nero the Emperor-god. Says Principal IVERACH, who writes the article: 'It was the refusal of the Church to submit to the Imperial cult that led to the declaration that they were outlaws, with no rights, and with no legal standing before the rulers. The test of their standing was whether they were willing to burn incense or to offer worship to Cæsar.'

Pass to the article 'Cakes and Loaves.' How little the shewbread means to us until we see it in the light of Comparative Religion. How human it then becomes, and how instructive. First note that in the chamber of Bel-Merodach, in his temple at Babylon, stood a golden table on which were placed twelve, twenty-four, thirty-six, or even seventy-two cakes of unleavened bread, which the god was supposed to eat. That is the nearest

illustration. But from that to the Beltane cakes of Scotland the steps are traceable, and every step has a religious memory clinging to it.

The liturgist will revel in the articles on the 'Calendar.' The introductory article has been written by the first authority on the subject, Dr. J. K. FOTHERINGHAM, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. The author of the article on the Christian Calendar, Canon J. G. CARLETON of Dublin, has made himself equally master in his own department. There are other twenty-one articles on the Calendar, among them the Armenian Calendar, by Professor MACLER of Paris; the Babylonian, by Professor HOMMEL of Munich; the Hebrew, by Mr. F. H. WOODS, late Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford; the Jewish, by Rabbi POZNANSKI of Warsaw; the Mexican and Mayan (most surprising in itself and in its relationships), by Professor PREUSS of Berlin; the Roman, by Mr. WARDE FOWLER; and the Teutonic, by Mr. MUNRO CHADWICK.

Passing Professor KROEBER's 'California,' we come to a short article by Mr. LAMBERT in Biblical and Historical Theology—'Call, Calling.' Not in Biblical Theology only. For that is the difference between the Biblical articles in the Encyclopædia and those in the *Dictionary of the Bible* and the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*.

They are Historical as well as Biblical, and gain greatly thereby both in clearness and in completeness. The Bible doctrine is the foundation, the historical and creedal is the fulfilment or falsification.

Professor ORR's article on 'Calvinism' follows immediately. Professor ORR is a Calvinist. For it is part of the plan of the Encyclopædia that subjects of debate should be written, if necessary, from both sides; if not, from the inside rather than the outside. As an example of the former method, there are three articles on 'Church.' One is written by a Presbyterian, one by an Anglican, and one by a Roman Catholic. The reading of these three articles, in none of which are any words wasted, is soon accomplished, and is as profitable for the thorough furnishing of the man of God as the reading of many books.

The article on the 'Cambridge Platonists' has been written by an Oxford man. The author is Dr. J. A. STEWART, Professor of Moral Philosophy. This is Professor STEWART's conclusion: 'The Cambridge Platonists hold their place in an "Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics" on four main grounds: (1) They present the idea of "personal religion" in a very impressive way, and with great sincerity. (2) They were preachers of religious toleration and comprehension, at a time when everything seemed to be against the prevalence of these ideas. (3) They gave direction to English Moral Philosophy by supplying Shaftesbury and his followers, down to the Utilitarians of the nineteenth century, with the notions of "good-nature" and "fellow-feeling," as dispositions relative to the "public good." (4) On the other hand, their use of the Platonic doctrine of Ideas, in theology and epistemology, presents them as contributing also to the idealistic side of English Moral Philosophy. T. H. Green's "reproduction of the Eternal Consciousness in my consciousness" bears close comparison with the Cambridge tenet—"participation of man's mind in God's mind through apprehension of the *eternæ rationes rerum*."

Comparison of Green with the Cambridge divines makes it clear that his philosophy is a phase of Christian Platonism.'

There was a great article on 'Animals' by Mr. Northcote THOMAS in the first volume. Only a very few animals have still to be treated separately. But one of them is the 'Camel.' The camel belongs to the Arabs, and its story has been told by a Muslim scholar, Professor GAUDEFROY-DEMOMBYNES. But his article is completed by another, written by Dr. Louis GRAY, and recording the place of the camel in the Old Testament and the Talmud, in Persia, India, Africa, and Europe. Dr. GRAY notices some camel proverbs, such as the Talmudic one that 'in Media the camel can dance in a bushel-basket'; but there are none comparable for point to the two spoken by Christ.

The student of Religion is a student of the greatest breadth of knowledge as well as of its greatest depth. His interests are both intense and extensive. He passes from the 'Cambridge Platonists' to the 'Camel,' and from the 'Camel' to the 'Camisards,' and the alphabetical arrangement brings no sense of incongruity. For all is of God. The Platonists speculate about His being, the Arabs ignorantly but devoutly sacrifice their camels to Him, the Camisards sacrifice themselves. The one word 'God' links all together and gives to all the unsearchable riches of interest and eternity.

Few of the articles in this volume can have cost their authors more than the article on the 'Canaanites.' And few mark more distinctly the progress of knowledge. The results of the recent excavations are all here, with exact references to the original sources. And here for the first time in English is a clear account of the way in which the pre-Israelite inhabitants of Palestine impressed themselves on the Old Testament. In a serious sense they conquered their conquerors, and have survived them. Take the single fact that 'in the earlier period the dead were usually deposited in

the contracted position of an unborn child.' It was no accident. It probably expressed the thought that death is birth into another life. What influence has that practice had on the belief in immortality; what preparation did it make for Him who at last brought life and immortality to light?

Or again. Take the fact that the Pharaoh of Egypt was worshipped as an incarnation of Amon-Re. In the palmy days of Egyptian sovereignty this worship was enforced in Canaan. Why have we no denunciation of this idolatry in the prophets? Why did it not drive the Israelites to the desperation of death, as the worship of the Roman Emperor drove the early Christians? Simply because it was so contrary to the genius of Semitic worship that it took no hold of the inhabitants of Canaan, but passed away along with the Egyptian rule before the prophets began to write.

From the 'Canaanites' to 'Candlemas.' This is an extension of one of the Calendar articles. It illustrates a characteristic of the Encyclopædia. Great topics are dealt with comprehensively in great articles or series of articles. But in order that nothing of importance may be passed over, a topic is occasionally selected out of the more comprehensive subject for separate and fuller treatment. Out of the Christian Calendar both 'Candlemas' and 'Christmas' have been chosen. The article on 'Candlemas' has been written by Mr. Thomas BARNES. On 'Christmas' there are two articles, one by Professor KIRSOPP LAKE of Leiden, the other by Professor LEHMANN of Berlin.

These articles are all contained within the first two hundred pages. Pass at once to the end. The last is the longest article in the volume. Its title is 'Confessions.' In some sixty pages Professor CURTIS of the University of Aberdeen has written an account of the Confessions of Christianity, the like of which is nowhere else to be found in any language. It is an article which,

if published separately and in the way in which books are commonly published, would very likely cost all the price of this volume of the Encyclopædia.

Are the chapters of the Fourth Gospel arranged in their proper order? It is a question of the first importance. For if its contents are not in order, much of the labour that has been spent on its interpretation has been thrown away. It is therefore astonishing that so much ability and even ingenuity has been given to the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, and to the adjusting of its contents with those of the other three, and so little to the previous and decisive question of its arrangement.

It is true that as long ago as the fourteenth century a rearrangement of the chapters of the Fourth Gospel was suggested by Ludolphus de Saxonia in his *Vita Christi Evangelicis et scriptoribus orthodoxis excerpta*. And every editor of the life of Christ, as well as every author of a synopsis of the Gospels, has had to move his materials so as to obtain something like a consistent narrative. But it is only recently that the question has been seriously considered whether an early accident had befallen the sheets of the Fourth Gospel. It is only WENDT, and more fully SPITTA, and most fully Warburton LEWIS, who have thoroughly examined this Gospel for the express purpose of bringing its contents back to their original order.

Mr. Warburton LEWIS has examined the Fourth Gospel for this purpose and this purpose only. He has made known the result of his examination in a book published at the Cambridge University Press under the title of *Disarrangements in the Fourth Gospel* (2s. net). It is a small book. We wish that Mr. LEWIS had had the courage to make it larger. For there is much in it, and it is all of the utmost consequence, not only to the laborious study of the Gospels, but also to their ordinary use in worship. But it is so condensed and contracted as to become very difficult reading.

There is one chapter in the Gospel which has often been the occasion of suspicion. It is the fifth. For to the most superficial reader it is evident that the insertion of that chapter sends our Lord travelling about between Galilee and Judæa in an inconsequential manner. In the fourth chapter He is in Galilee, and the end of that chapter leads us to expect that He will remain some time there. But the fifth chapter finds Him in Jerusalem. It also leaves Him there. Yet in the sixth He is back again in Galilee, and as if He had not for some time been out of it.

Change the order of the fifth and sixth chapters and all the puzzle is at an end. Christ's return to Galilee in the fourth chapter (v.⁴³) is followed by a period of work there (as 4⁵⁴ leads us to expect), which is described in the sixth chapter, and comes to a crisis in the end of that chapter (6⁶⁶), when many of His disciples withdraw from Him. Thereupon He leaves Galilee and goes up to Jerusalem, where we find Him throughout chapters 5 and 7.

Other advantages follow. The statement in 7¹ that He could no longer walk in Judæa is explained, whereas according to the end of the previous chapter He was not in Judæa, but in Galilee. Again, we are able to give a natural interpretation to 4³⁵, 'Yet four months, and then cometh harvest.' For we now see that Jesus returned to Galilee in December, and the crisis which drove Him out of Galilee to Jerusalem, the desertion of many of His followers (6⁶⁶), occurred four months later, just before the Passover. And, most important advantage of all, the 'feast' mentioned in the fifth chapter, and over which there has been so much controversy, finds its explanation at once in the subsequent Pentecost.

We have reached the beginning of chapter the seventh. And we have seen that the situation there fits admirably into the situation at the end of chapter the fifth. But we have not gone far into the seventh chapter itself when we come upon a section which is obviously out of place. This

is the section 7¹⁵⁻²⁴. So obviously out of place is it here, and so evidently would it be in its proper place if it stood at the end of the fifth chapter, that not only SPITTA and LEWIS make the change, but also BURTON and MOFFATT and WENDT.

This is a good case to test the whole proceeding by. First let us see that 7²⁵ follows naturally after 7¹⁴. Then let us see if 7¹⁵⁻²⁴ will fit in easily at the end of the fifth chapter. Mr. Warburton LEWIS has his arguments, and they seem conclusive. But it is better for every man to work the problem out for himself.

The question rises, however: How did this displacement take place? Mr. LEWIS has no better explanation to offer than that which has been suggested by SPITTA, that the Gospel was written on leaves, and before the leaves were gummed together they got disarranged. One interesting result, however, is obtained. If the passage 7¹⁵⁻²⁴ was a single leaf, then chapter 6 contains just seven such leaves. Mr. LEWIS comes to the conclusion afterwards that the leaf was less than that. He believes that 7¹⁵⁻²⁴ filled two leaves. And this unit of measurement (which would be 9½ lines of WESTCOTT and HORT) is used by him to test the accuracy of other attempts which he makes at rearrangement. When he has examined the whole Gospel, he concludes that the arrangement of its parts before the accident occurred was as follows:—1 to 2¹²; 3²²⁻³⁰, 2¹³ to 3²¹; 3³¹⁻³⁶; 4; 6; 5, 7¹⁵⁻²⁴, 8¹²⁻²⁰; 7¹⁻¹⁴, 7²⁵⁻⁵², 8²¹⁻⁵⁹; 9 to 12; 13¹⁻³²; 15, 16; 13³³ to 14; 17; 18 to 20; 21.

In a recent number of the *Sunday School Times* of Philadelphia there is an article by Professor G. A. Johnston Ross on the question, 'Why we need to go to Church.'

Churchgoing, says Professor Ross, has been abandoned by persons who desire to escape the call to serious thinking. They go to places 'where

their superficialities and inanities will be uninvaded.' And the Church may derive benefit from their departure. There is a more serious loss than that.

There are to-day, says Professor Ross, earnest thoughtful men who abandon the fellowship of the Church, not because they wish to throw off religion, but because they wish to retain it. They have begun, in accordance with the spirit of the age, to build up for themselves an interpretation of life, working not with superimposed schemes, but with the facts they see. They do not claim to have arrived at final results in these, perhaps more or less desultory, attempts at an interpretation. But they have begun to see some things. And what they have begun to see will not express itself readily in the language of the Churches, and yet it seems greatly more real than that language appears to be. Now it is imperative to men in the present day that they come into contact in their thought with reality. And so men are abandoning the Church because its worship and its thought appear unreal.

Are these men right? Professor Ross does not think so. He believes that they have failed to realize what corporate worship is, and what it can do for them. And he believes that the Churches are partly to blame. We have dwelt too exclusively, he thinks, on the individual's attitude to religion. The social character of even the Lord's Supper has been, he believes, too much obscured in the evangelical Churches. And he says: 'Had men been taught the wonder and the pathos and the dignity of social worship—had that worship been always conducted in the spirit not merely of decorum but of awe, I cannot believe that thoughtful men in such numbers would have withdrawn from it.'

For there is individual worship and there is social worship. The heart of the individual worshipper cries out for the living God. But that craving does not originate in the heart. It is the

response of the human to the divine desire. 'Thou wouldst not seek God,' says Pascal, 'if thou hadst not already found Him.' But Professor Johnston Ross amends Pascal, and says, surely rather, 'if God had not already found thee.' Worship is the resultant, not alone of our craving for God, but of God's craving for us. It is not our unpunctuated monologue; it is, between us and God, reciprocal and responsive dialogue.

But this is individual worship only. What is corporate worship? What is the worship of the whole Church? It is not merely divine communication and human response: it is ordered and varied divine communication, it is ordered and varied human response. 'When one joins a group of worshippers,' says Dr. Ross, 'one enters to take one's part in the ordered response of the Church universal to the outgoing of the heart of God; one enters a region where heaven dips down to earth, while earth lifts up "blind hands" to heaven; one is at the meeting-place of the two orders, the temporal and the eternal; one is standing with one's fellows before the rending veil.'

And there are other gains to be got from corporate worship. There is outlook. There is 'the restfulness of its wide horizons.' The daily work of most of us is done within a very narrow sphere of interest and enterprise. In the fellowship of the Church we have a unique opportunity of emerging from these limitations.

The solitary worshipper replies that it is precisely this wide outlook that he desires. For this he deserts the Church. This emancipation, he says, this sense of spacious liberty, he cannot obtain in the Church, and he seeks it in the open field, in communion with nature. Professor Ross answers profoundly, that no man can enter into the fullest liberty if he is alone with nature and the God of nature. An essential element in the vision of far horizons is the presence of a body of aspirant life. It is 'with all saints,' not with nature, that we

comprehend the love of God. It is where two or three are gathered together to search into His Name, that He is in the midst.

And another gain to be obtained from corporate worship is quiet of spirit. Who has not known perplexities drop away, who has not seen problems solved, in the contemplation and experience of the fellowship of the Church? Moods that have distressed us have been dispelled by merely seeing them reflected in the experience of fellow-worshippers, whether of our own or of other ages.

Controversies which have vexed us have been settled in the light of the broad plain moralities of the Gospel. Exaggerations of view have been checked by the thought of the manifold variety of catholic Christian experience. Forgotten factors in difficult questions have come to light as we have learned to look at life from the point of view of God's residence in the collective body of His redeemed. We have repeated the Psalmist's experience: 'When I thought to know this, it was too painful for me, till I went into the sanctuary of God; then understood I.'

The History of Religions, and its Introduction into the German Universities.

BY THE REV. LOUIS H. JORDAN, B.D., OXFORD.

THE recent establishment of a new University chair marks the inauguration in Germany of a notable academic departure. Surprisingly little attention seems to have been paid, either in Great Britain or America, to the taking of a step which is profoundly significant, and to the radical reversal of procedure which it registers and portends. It is curious that an event so important in itself, and more important still because of its inevitable consequences, should not have been made more generally known.

The honour of founding in Germany the first chair devoted to the study of the History of Religions, and of assigning it a place in the authorized curriculum of a Faculty of Theology, belongs to the University of Berlin. Strictly speaking, it is more accurate to say that this honour belongs to a little group of men who, not discouraged by numerous previous defeats, have at last carried the day. Nay, more: it is infinitely to their credit that they have won their victory in the council-chamber of the most representative seat of learning in the whole empire.

Germany has long been distinguished for the comparative indifference with which her leading teachers, and especially her theological teachers, have treated the investigations which scholars of other countries have been pursuing in this

department. Professor Harnack, on the other hand, has led an aggressive opposition: he has been persistently and unreservedly outspoken in his objections and criticisms. Again and again he has maintained that the student of theology has already to bestow his attention upon too large a number of subjects, and that the study of the General History of Religions presents features of special difficulty with which, if he be wise, he will not needlessly intermeddle. Until quite recently, these views have been held, more or less rigidly, by the chief representatives of all the Theological Faculties in Germany. Even by teachers of the Philosophical Faculties, who devote an exceptional amount of time to the elucidation of the Philosophy of Religion, the prior study of the History of Religions has been strangely neglected. Occasional classes have indeed been organized, and a few Dozenten have announced brief courses of lectures on this theme; but the number of students who have presented themselves for enrolment has been distinctly disappointing, and the effort has usually been abandoned before very long.

Happily some enthusiastic souls—aware of what was being accomplished elsewhere in this field, and persuaded that perseverance would yet obtain its reward—have refused to be discouraged. For many years, Professors Wellhausen of Göttingen,

Oldenberg of Kiel, Pischel of Halle, Nöldeke of Strasburg, Vollers of Jena, Wiedemann of Bonn, Pfeiderer of Berlin—not to mention others—have rendered valuable and enduring service in this connexion; but, with the single exception of Professor Pfeiderer, not one of them has accomplished his chosen and distinctive life-work as the occupant of a theological chair. Hence the contributions which these scholars have been able to make to the study now under consideration have usually been more or less casual, and invariably intermittent. Even Dr. Pfeiderer, whose allotted task compelled him to devote himself chiefly to Christian Apologetics and Exegetics, made only brief excursions into the domain of the History of Religions. His work in this department, accordingly, is often very faulty. His books reveal the determined persistence of many a presupposition. They abound in conclusions which, among all carefully trained experts, evoke instant and constant dissent. Nevertheless his writings, in various particulars, are penetrative, suggestive, and acute.

Towards the end of his life, Professor Pfeiderer came to recognize the profound importance of this new study. Gradually it ceased to be for him a mere 'aside,' an inquiry which he prosecuted whenever the opportunity presented itself; it became, in truth, one of the main channels of his later intellectual activity. Moreover, he sought diligently to increase his competency to face a serious and very difficult undertaking. It was in pursuance of this quest, following upon his *Das Urchristentum, seine Schriften und Lehren* (1887; fully revised edition, 1902), that there issued in rapid succession from the press his *Das Christusbild des urchristlichen Glaubens in religionsgeschichtlicher Bedeutung* (1903); *Die Entstehung des Christentums* (1905); *Religion und Religionen* (1906); and then, finally, his *Die Entwicklung des Christentums* (1907).

A good deal of speculation naturally arose concerning Professor Pfeiderer's probable successor. During the interregnum that followed upon his death, the friends of the History of Religions left no stone unturned that promised to afford help in securing its early introduction into the University curriculum. The hopes and convictions of Dr. Pfeiderer were judiciously kept in the foreground. Opposition was gradually overcome. Professor Harnack—still unpersuaded,

but with that openness of mind that has always marked his course—withdrew his previously expressed objections; nay, accepting the verdict to which others had been led, and sympathizing frankly with their eager and growing enthusiasm, he soon manifested a deep personal interest in the effort that was being made to obtain the very best available teacher. It was under these circumstances that a decision was finally reached. It was resolved that, whoever might be invited to occupy the vacant chair, he must accept it on the understanding that it had now become a professorship of the History of Religions.

It is not surprising that, before many months, three names stood out prominently among the prospective nominees.

In Holland, among the younger men, there was Professor Kristensen, the successor of the late Dr. Tiele at Leyden. His high competency had won for him his present post; and his courses of lectures on the History of Religions, during the last ten years, have firmly established him in the confidence and affection of his students. He has as yet written comparatively little, but his colleagues know his worth. He is fully entitled to be a co-worker with scholars of the standing of Chantepie de la Saussaye and De Groot. European research already regards him, in the department to which he has devoted himself, as one of its most promising representatives.

In Denmark, Professor Lehmann has for years been steadily pressing his way to the front. A few months before Professor Kristensen began his work as a member of the Theological Faculty in Leyden, Dr. Lehmann commenced his lectures as a Privat Dozent of the Philosophical Faculty in Copenhagen. This post was practically created for him, as Professor Scharling—a member of the Theological Faculty, and under the necessity of devoting his strength chiefly to Dogmatics and Ethics—could not give sufficient time to the growingly important study of the History of Religions. Unlike Professor Kristensen, Dr. Lehmann has written a good deal. He has contributed constantly to the current Reviews. He has lent considerable help in the preparation of the massive *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*,—the section on Primitive Religion, appearing in the volume allotted to Oriental Religions (1906), having come from his pen. It is to him we also owe those sections of the *Lehrbuch der Religions-*

geschichte (2nd edition, 1897) which deal with Hindu, Persian, and Greek Religions. Yet further, he has published a number of independent treatises of conspicuous value. It will suffice to name his *Hedensk Monotheisme* (1897); *Zarathustra, en bog om Persernes gamle*, 2 vols. (1899-1902); *Mystik i Hedenskab og Kristendom* (1904); and *Buddha* (1907).

Finally, Sweden was also distinctly in the running, in the person of Professor Söderblom of Upsala. A member of the Theological Faculty of his University, with which he has been connected for nearly twenty years, he has gained wide experience both as a student and teacher. A familiar figure at the quadrennial meetings of the International Congress of the History of Religions, and a Doctor of Theology of Paris, he is the author of a formidable array of publications. Perhaps one may specify, in particular, *La vie future d'après le Mazdéisme, à la lumière des croyances parallèles dans les autres religions* (1901); *Die Religionen der Erde* (1905); and *Studiet Av Religionen* (1908). His *Kompendium der Religionsgeschichte* (1903), a careful and able revision of the *Outlines of the History of Religion* which Tiele published in Dutch in 1876, has rendered such good service that a further revision (bringing it up to date) is already in great demand. Moreover, his *Frammande Religionsurkunder* (1908)—wherein, aided by a corps of eminent local scholars, Dr. Söderblom has presented us in four compact volumes with the texts of the chief Sacred Books of the world, together with admirable Swedish translations of these texts—has made the name of its editor a household word among scientific workers everywhere.

The choice ultimately fell upon Dr. Lehmann. As can easily be imagined, a good deal of anxiety prevailed in various quarters until the matter was finally settled. In Germany, some entertained the fear that, after all, the proposal to establish a chair for the History of Religions might for some cause miscarry. In Holland, Denmark, and Sweden considerable alarm was felt lest an honoured and beloved teacher might be coaxed to go away. As it happens, all parties interested—with the exception, of course, of the University of Copenhagen—are to be sincerely congratulated. Germany, undoubtedly, is to be congratulated most of all. The University of Berlin has secured, for itself and for its students, a scholar of very high

merit. His studies have made him familiar with all the chief pioneers and masters in this field. He has enjoyed ample opportunities as a teacher. He knows the literature of his subject as few of his contemporaries would presume to claim to know it, seeing that he has been the editor of this particular sub-section of the *Theologischer Jahresbericht* (formerly of Berlin, but now of Leipsic) since 1900. He will in future, with greater authority than ever, furnish that publication with his annual surveys of books dealing with the History of Religions. Yet further; since Professor Lehmann has recently succeeded Professor Chantepie de la Saussaye as editor of the *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*, still unrivalled and already in its third edition, he occupies to-day a truly outstanding position among the very foremost promoters of that study. In a few months, he will complete his first year of service. It is gratifying to know that his lectures are being well attended. His classes in the General History of Religions, in Primitive Religion, and in Zoroastrianism have attracted not a few American students, while 'wise men from the East' are also in evidence among his regular hearers.

In reviewing this significant episode, it is not too much to say that an academic revolution has been successfully accomplished. Yet it has been effected without commotion or disturbance. Professor Pfeiderer's chair has disappeared, and in its place we now see one which some of the highest authorities frequently declared would never be established. It is at present the only chair of its kind in the German Empire. But the end is not yet. The full consequences of this step none can foresee; but it is no longer denied that they will be many and far-reaching. No doubt there are some, even in Berlin itself, who do not fully realize the meaning of the move that has been so quietly made. Its influence will, however, be felt far beyond Germany; indeed, it bids fair to usher in, throughout the world, an entirely new era in the history of a very important department of theological inquiry. Germany has hitherto had to accept light and leading in this field from the scholars of other lands. The representative leaders in this branch of investigation have hitherto been working under Dutch, French, Swedish, or American auspices. When it was decided to inaugurate a University chair of this sort in one of the German Universities, it became

necessary to invite a foreigner to occupy it. But Berlin will not long stand alone in its possession of this inviting department of research. Neither will Germany always have to import, during its inevitable expansion, competent and coveted teachers. Professor Lehmann will soon be supported by colleagues, stationed at other strategic centres, who are native to the land of his adoption. For, as I ventured to declare some years ago: 'There is no other country in the world which is so well fitted to enter, and without delay, upon the task of imparting systematic instruction in this subject. . . . Where can one find the University

equipment—in individual scholars, in the aggregate of a highly trained staff, in libraries, etc.—equal to that which Germany to-day possesses? . . . As long as Germany postpones the founding of separate chairs for giving instruction in the History of Religions, she will never do herself credit in any attempted comparison of religions.'¹ The first step, however belated, has at last been taken. All must hope that, before very long, Comparative Religion will likewise be accorded official and adequate recognition.

¹ Cp. *Comparative Religion: Its Genesis and Growth*, pp. 512-516. Edinburgh, 1905.

The Great Text Commentary.

PSALM XIV. 1.

'The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God.'

It is probable that when the Psalmist wrote these words he was alluding to no imaginary case. He was not fancying what men might do, but was speaking of what they actually did, when he described a man as saying in his heart, 'There is no God.' There were Atheists in his days, practical Atheists at least, as there have been in all days, and probably ever will be; and the general bearing of the Psalm from which the text is taken, teaches us pretty clearly the judgment which he formed of them. You will observe, that from the expression of the first verse of the Psalm, 'The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God,' the Psalmist at once goes off into a description of the abominably wicked lives of those who said so.

The folly spoken of in the text is (so to speak) representative folly: the Atheism of which the fool was guilty, was nothing peculiar to himself; on the other hand, he only said in his heart that which millions of others have said more or less distinctly: he represented the ignorance of some, and the fear of others, and the guilty wish of many more; and when the Psalmist wrote the text, he put into the mouth of him whom he describes as *the fool* that which is in reality the characteristic folly of mankind. As the knowledge of God may be said to comprehend all knowledge, so to say *There is no*

God may be described as comprehending all folly.

This Psalm was one of Queen Elizabeth's delights, probably it expressed her view of the stormy and ungodly age in which she lived, with promise of better things to come. She turned it into verses beginning, 'Fooles, that true fayth yet never had,' and ending with 'Prayse to God.' As this was printed in 1578 it is easy to see that she meant, by her version of the sixth verse, her Romish enemies:

'How can that cruell sort be good,
Of God's dear folcke whych sucke the blood?'¹

As a young lad I worked in a large office. Having purchased during the day *The Smallest Bible in the World*, I was trying my best during a few slack moments to read its extremely small type with the naked eye. A fellow-worker having atheistic tendencies approached me and inquired as to what I was reading. I explained the nature of the book, and asked him if he thought he could read the small text without the aid of a glass. At the time we were in a room alone. Opening the book by chance he began to read. Slowly at first, but more confidently as his eyes got into focus, he read out these momentous words: 'The—fool—hath—said—in—his—heart,—There—is—no—God.' He stopped for a moment as if in difficulty with the next word. 'Well?' said I inquiringly. Turning round, he gazed for a moment into my eyes with a strange pleading look, and then, handing me back the book, he left the room without saying a word.

We may consider—

1. The Fool.
2. What the Fool says.
3. How he says it.

¹ C. L. Marson, *The Psalms at Work*, 29.

I.

THE FOOL.

The Hebrew word for 'fool' here is very interesting and instructive. It defines the Psalmist's attitude, and sheds a flood of light on the intention of the Psalm. It means properly 'withered,' being the word which occurs in the First Psalm, where it is said of the godly man that he is 'like a tree planted by the streams of water, that bringeth forth its fruit in its season, whose leaf also doth not *wither*.' And so the fool here is one whose soul is withered, shrivelled, and atrophied, and if you glance over the Psalm, you will see what it is that has wrought the mischief. It is not intellectual aberration, but moral depravity—the blight of uncleanness, the canker of corruption. 'They are corrupt, they have done abominable works; there is none that doeth good. They are all gone aside; they are together become filthy; there is none that doeth good, no, not one.' It is this that withers the soul; and it is the man whose heart has thus been eaten out of him that says and thinks that 'There is no God.'

'Fool,' the usual rendering in A.V., R.V., is inadequate and confusing; the Heb. *nabhal* was in many respects a very different character from what is ordinarily understood in English by a 'fool'; and the rendering at the same time obliterates the distinction between this and the other words which are correctly represented by 'fool.' The fault of the *nabhal* was not weakness of reason, but moral and religious insensibility, an invincible lack of sense, or perception for the claims of either God or man. The term is thus applied to Israel, unappreciative of Jehovah's benefits (Dt 32⁶), to the heathen (v.³¹, Ps 74^{18, 22}), to the man who cannot perceive that there is a God (Ps 14¹ = 53¹). Isaiah states explicitly what he understood by the *nabhal*: he contrasts him (32⁵) with the 'noble' or 'liberal' man, and adds (v.⁶), 'For the senseless man speaketh senselessness, and his heart worketh naughtiness, to practise profaneness, and to utter error against Jehovah, to make empty the soul of the hungry, and to cause the drink of the thirsty to fail'; the description is that of a man who is at once irreligious and churlish (cf. 1 S 25²⁵). The word occurs besides, 2 S 3³³ 13¹³, Job 2¹⁰ 30⁸, Pr 17^{7, 21} (second clause) 30²², Jer 17¹¹ Ezk 13³. The corresponding subst. *senselessness* is used of acts of profanity (Jos 7¹³), churlishness (1 S 25²⁵), and immorality (Gn 34⁷, Dt 22²¹, 2 S 13¹², and elsewhere).¹

'The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God.' When I was stationed in Bury (Lancs) it was my privilege to attend a series of lectures under the auspices of the Bury Popular Lecture Society. These lectures were given by men

who were interested in some special subject, or were travellers, musicians, etc. One of them was by a Mr. Jones who had scaled some of the world's loftiest peaks. He declared that no man could go and stand where he had stood and say 'There is no God.' He had heard of one mountaineer who had ascended half-way up a dizzy height. He there wrote upon the rocks the words, 'There is no God.' He then continued his ascent and went on until he reached the top. When he saw beneath him range after range of snow-clad summits, there came over him a sense of awe, and on his descent he wrote over what he had previously written, 'The fool hath said in his heart.'

An animalcule in my blood
Rose up against me as I dreamed,
He was so tiny as he stood,
You had not heard him, though he screamed.

He cried, 'There is no man!'
And thumped the table with his fist,
Then died—his day was scarce a span,—
That microscopic atheist.

Yet all the while his little soul
Within what he denied did live,—
Poor part, how could he know the whole?
And yet he was so positive!

And all the while he thus blasphemed,
My (solar) system went its round;
My heart beat on, my head still dreamed—
But my poor atheist was drowned.²

II.

WHAT THE FOOL SAYS.

'The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God.'—And the fool, as we have seen, is a vile man, morally degenerate. Why does the vile man say, There is no God? Because that is what the vile man wishes to believe. The wish is 'father to the thought.' In that familiar phrase we express a profound philosophy. Our wishing is the father of much of our thinking. Our desires colour and determine many of our judgments. I wish that a certain thing may happen. That wish will not travel alone. Let it continue, and it will drag the judgment after it. I shall come to *think* that the certain thing *will* happen. The wish may become an assumption. Let the wish be strengthened and intensified, and I may come to judge that the certain thing *has* happened. The wish may become an assumption; the assumption may become a conviction.

¹ S. R. Driver, *Parallel Psalter*, 457.

² Richard Le Gallienne.

He who has deepest searched the wide abyss
Of that life-giving Soul which men call fate,
Knows that to put more faith in lies and hate
Than truth and love, is the true atheism.¹

I. What reasons does the Fool give for saying that there is no God? At the present day one reason surpasses and practically obliterates all other reasons. Events, it is said, occur automatically, according to laws inherent in their own nature. There is, therefore, no room for God and no need for Him. Men say they have discovered, or they have heard and read, that the great natural forces of the universe act in certain defined and invariable methods or sequences, which are somewhat questionably named 'the laws of Nature.' And these laws, so at least they suppose and affirm, leave no room for the free play of a creative and governing Will. If they admit the possible existence of God, it is only that of a God who, ages and æons ago, set these great natural forces in motion, but who has ever since left them to work out into their due results, according to the invariable methods which science has discovered and formulated. 'There is no God,' they say; or, 'There is no God who can so use and so vary the use of natural laws as to answer the prayers, or minister to the wants, of individual men.'

This argument has often been met by arguments of a superior force. It has been shown, for example, how the freewill and activity of man perpetually modify the action of natural laws, how he employs these laws for ends of his own, and compels them to produce results other than those which Nature, left to itself, would have produced; how he works his miracles, taking a weed and by culture developing it into a flower; putting a tree into a stove, and so inducing it to bear earlier and richer fruit; using a drug to arrest or modify the natural course of a disease. And it has been asked, 'If man, by serving Nature, can thus rule her; if, by a wise obedience and a skilful use of her laws, he can control and modify their action, why cannot God—if there be a God, and He be immanent in Nature—so use its laws as to work even greater miracles than these?'

To those who conceive that the reign of law necessarily excludes the free play of will and intelligence, we affirm, that just as the strictest observation of its rules leaves full scope to the intelligence and will of man, so the laws of nature, which

cannot be broken, may and do leave full scope to the Divine Intelligence and Goodwill. God both is, and is not, bound by the laws which He Himself has decreed: that is to say, if for the welfare of the universe He is bound to observe them, to observe them does not bring His will into bondage, nor restrict Him to an absolute uniformity in the choice of the means by which His end is to be reached. He moves freely through those laws, using them at times in the methods we call 'natural,' and at times in the methods we call 'supernatural,' because as yet we do not understand them, nor comprehend the whole scheme and course even of physical forces and laws.

A man would have as little meaning without a God as a child without a mother. You will find it useless to *argue* with a sceptic about God—arguments help so little—and you cannot demonstrate the Unseen in black and white. But before a man says there is no God, ask him if he can explain away the miracle of a mother. He will not be able to do it, for he cannot explain away himself. And when you have got him to realize the miracle of motherhood, he will not be very far from believing in a God.²

In Westminster Abbey lies the dust of one whom all men venerate as a Prince of Science. 'I do not know what I may appear to the world,' were Sir Isaac Newton's words shortly before his death, 'but to myself I seem to have been only like a boy playing on the seashore, and diverting myself in now and then finding a smoother pebble or a prettier shell than ordinary, whilst the great ocean of truth lay all undiscovered before me.' Parted from Sir Isaac Newton's grave by but a few yards lie the mortal remains of another student of Nature, whose name is hardly less famous in the Calendar of Science. In his later years we are assured that Charles Darwin 'attained to the condition of agnosticism.' To his cautious and reverent mind, as to Newton's, the crude dogmatism of the Atheist was repulsive. By the side of Darwin lies the great astronomer, Sir John Herschell, of whom one who knew him well said that of all the scientific men of his acquaintance he was 'supremely at the head for knowledge, simplicity, and humility.' His private life, we are told, 'was one unbroken tenor of domestic affection and unostentatious piety.' Walk westwards from the graves of Newton, Darwin, and Herschell, and you will find, but a few yards distant, the stone which bears the name of the illustrious geologist, Sir Charles Lyell. Of him we have this testimony from the pen of Dean Stanley. 'From early youth to extreme old age it was to him a solemn religious duty to be incessantly learning, constantly growing, fearlessly correcting his own mistakes, always ready to receive and reproduce from others that which he had not in himself. Science and religion for him were not only not divorced, but were one and indivisible.' Quite recently another leader of science has spoken in that reverent and humble spirit, which is common both to true

¹ Lowell.

² T. R. Barnett, *The Finest Baby in the World*, p. 55.

science and to sound theology. 'Scientific thought,' wrote Lord Kelvin, 'is compelled to accept the idea of Creative Power. Forty years ago I asked Liebig, walking somewhere in the country, if he believed that the grass and flowers which we saw around us grew by mere chemical forces. He answered, "No, no more than I could believe that a book of botany describing them could grow by mere chemical forces."' ¹

A garden is a lovesome thing, God wot!

Rose plot,

Fring'd pool,

Fern'd grot—

The veriest school

Of peace; and yet the fool

Contentends that God is not—

Not God! in gardens! when the eve is cool?

Nay, but I have a sign;

'Tis very sure God walks in mine.²

2. What reasons can be given for the Existence and Moral Government of God?

1. There is the fact that science, when most willing to deny God's hand, is compelled to admit its presence, or at least the possibility of its presence. Science deals only with phenomena, with the shows and appearances of things; and it is compelled to assume a substance, a reality, a force, underlying all these phenomena—what the schoolmen call a *noumenal*, under or behind the phenomenal world—which it has not grasped, and cannot hope to grasp.

'The whole order of nature,' recently wrote Professor Ray Lankester, 'including living and lifeless matter—man, animal, and gas—is a network of mechanism, the main features and many details of which have been made more or less obvious to the wondering intelligence of mankind by the labour and ingenuity of scientific investigators. But no sane man has ever pretended, since science became a definite body of doctrine, that we know, or ever can hope to know, or conceive of the possibility of knowing, whence this mechanism has come, why it is there, whither it is going, and what there may or may not be beyond and beside it which our senses are incapable of appreciating. These things are not "explained" by science, and never can be.'³

2. The existence and presence of God is demanded by the history of the race. God is a God of history. A God of history, a God revealing His purpose through facts, a God drawing the facts into ever clearer correspondence with His purpose—that is the God whom we arrive at. He is still a God here and now, alive in the facts before our face, even as we, by our primal

emotional apprehension of Him, insisted and required. But, according to our gathering and growing conception of His abiding reality, He is here and now, shaping the facts into a coherent order in view of what shall be hereafter: in view of what He desires the facts to become. His activity is immediate, actual, present, in form, in front of us; but it works on the top of the past; and it embraces the possibilities of the future.⁴

I saw the beauty of the world
Before me like a flag unfurled,
The splendour of the morning sky,
And all the stars in company;
I thought, How beautiful it is!—
My soul said, There is more than this.

I saw the poms of death and birth,
The generations of the earth;
I looked on saints and heroes crowned,
And love as wide as heaven is round;
I thought, How wonderful it is!—
My soul said, There is more than this.

Sometimes I have an awful thought
That bids me do the thing I ought,
It comes like wind, it burns like flame,—
How shall I give that thought a name?
It draws me like a loving kiss—
My soul says, There is more than this.

I dreamed an angel of the Lord,
With purple wings and golden sword,
And such a splendour in His face
As made a glory in the place;
I thought, How beautiful He is!—
My soul said, There is more than this.

That angel's Lord I cannot see
Or hear, but He is Lord to me;
And in the heavens, and earth, and skies,—
The good which lives till evil dies,—
The love which I cannot withstand,—
God writes His name with His own hand.⁵

3. Belief in the existence of God is necessary for the individual and social life. The sense of responsibility which we have, the sense, namely, that we are capable of right and wrong, that it is our own fault if we do the wrong and reject the right, would not be strong enough to stand by itself, did not the thought of the righteous God and His law and His judgment come in to confirm and strengthen it; so that if the belief in a God is altogether overthrown, there is, at the same time, overthrown that which is in ninety-nine cases out

¹ H. H. Henson.

² T. E. Brown.

³ H. H. Henson.

⁴ H. S. Holland.

⁵ W. B. Rands, *Lilliput Lectures* (1897 ed.), p. 132.

of a hundred the strongest safeguard of morality, namely, the consciousness of God as a righteous ruler, one who will judge us according to the right or the wrong of that which we have done. In the vast majority of men the sense of responsibility, without which morality can scarce exist, would not survive the absolute extinction of all belief in the existence of a God, of a spiritual world, of a future state whose conditions are influenced by the lives we have lived here.

Underneath the floor of Westminster Abbey lies David Livingstone; just within the western wall is inscribed the name of Charles Gordon; all about you, as you walk through the great church, are monuments of goodness, and sacrifice, and service. What, you cannot help reflecting, is the spring of this distinctive and supreme excellence which, among so much and so varied greatness, attaches uniquely to these saints and soldiers of humanity? And you cannot but answer that it was, precisely, religion, faith in the Unseen, the coercive and continuous sense of obligation towards and contact with God. Of them all we might say what the sacred writer says of Moses, exposed to the seductions of the Egyptian Court. They, as he, 'endured as seeing him who is invisible.'¹

4. And, above all else, man needs a Redeemer. We must take our choice between the vague Theism or vaguer Agnosticism, which is all that physical science can bring to us, and the Faith in God which Jesus Christ proclaims. There is the fact: here is the explanation. Is it adequate? What, let us ask, is, apart from theological technicalities, the essential Truth which the Trinitarian doctrine enshrines? It will suffice, for our present purpose, to distinguish two constituent notions of our belief. On the one hand, Trinitarianism includes the truth which philosophy, ancient and modern, has insisted upon, that the universe is everywhere indwelt by God, that God is immanent in phenomena, their source, their sustaining principle, their formative, inherent force; and while thus satisfying what seems to be an essential requirement of our reflective reason, Trinitarianism insists upon the correlative truth which has its perpetual witness in the human conscience, that God transcends the universe which He indwells, that He can best be conceived in that description of personality which is the category of the highest existence we know. On the other hand, Trinitarianism endorses, explains, and satisfies the 'thirst for God' which burns in the spirit of man. For God has made man for Him-

self; and in man moves His Spirit, for ever witnessing to an origin and a destiny which are Divine; and man, just in proportion to his goodness as man, comes to be more completely competent for fellowship with God, so that, in truth, manhood in its perfection is the true instrument by which God can be made known. Trinitarianism is the philosophic basis of the belief in the Incarnation; the Incarnation is, precisely, the climax of Divine Self-revelation, the declaration of God in and by Jesus Christ. To this cry of the Psalmist, 'My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God: when shall I come and appear before God?' Christianity answers by an appeal to the best in man, and then sets us in audience of the Best Man, who was also God. First, we are to recognize and confess the Divine within ourselves; then we are to recognize and confess the Divine in Christ. But Christianity not only authenticates the testimony within, but points us to the Christ without. To the yearning cry of the human spirit, stricken with fear and loneliness in the great solitude of being, aghast before the enigma of death and the veiled mystery beyond—the cry of the strayed child for the Hand of the Father in the night of desertion, 'My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God'—Christ makes answer in words of invitation: 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.'

III.

HOW HE SAYS IT.

'The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God.' That is what the fool said, but it is the way in which he said it that revealed him to be a fool. There are souls that just whisper to themselves, 'There is no God,' and the secret utterance seems to chill their blood and fill them with benumbing fear. Repeated calamity comes upon a man. The floods are out. All his ways are broken up. The lines of his life are filled with perversity. Confusion reigns. He moves amid his desolation, himself confused and desolate, and now and again a thought sweeps across his heart with the chilling touch of a cold night-wind, 'There is no God.' Is he a fool, the fool of the text? He is eagerly

¹ H. H. Henson.

groping his way, as though feeling for some longed-for presence, like a blind man reaching out for some tangible support, and he touches nothing. He sighs in his failure, and whispers, 'There is no God.' But again he gropes: 'Oh, that I knew where I might find Him!' In his sorrow and calamity he is like a little child in the evening-time, lost amid the multitudinous windings of some great city, inquiring his way home. He is feeling his way to God; and if in the sense of a great vacancy his heart should fearfully say, 'There is no God,' it deepens his sense of orphanage, and fills him with an aching loneliness and pain. No; that is not the man of the text. He is seeking, and 'he that seeketh findeth,' and shall at length find himself at home with God. A heart that is as a beautiful garden, filled with the flowers of the Spirit, will exhale wishes full of sweet and pleasant influence. But a heart that is only a moral cesspool will exhale wishes of vicious and poisonous stench. As we are, we wish; as we wish, we think; as we think, we judge. This man of the text had the cesspool in his heart. He was ungodly at the core. He began to wish there was no God; and at last, with impious hilarity and with a note of unholy triumph, 'the fool said in his heart, There is no God.'

In the life of men and women, in politics, in morality, and in religion, all that gives to our existence colour and force, all that makes the individual value of each separate soul the deepest element, comes not from the head, but from the heart. In the individual preferences—of friendship, for example—that go so far to mould character and fix destiny, by what rational law shall we explain the principles of attraction and repulsion? How, for example, shall we account for the obvious fact that what men call their political opinions are so absolutely inconsistent with their views upon all other subjects; how, except that the so-called opinion is that of some soul which, by the magic of its personal electricity, has been able to touch others into sympathy? How often is it possible by dint of logic to argue a man or woman out of liking or disliking? 'The heart aye, is the part aye, that makes us right or wrong.' The state of heart is that which determines the wisdom or the foolishness of a human life.¹

Professor A. B. Simpson tells how he was once asked by a brilliant lawyer for the best argument against infidelity. He was, he affirmed, a sincere seeker after truth. Dr. Simpson handed him from his library Bushnell's *Nature and the Supernatural*, and asked him to read carefully the famous chapter on Christ's resurrection, in which the argument is presented as a barrister would present a case to the

jury. The young lawyer took the volume and promised to return in a fortnight and report his conclusions. He kept his appointment. 'I can never doubt,' he exclaimed to Professor Simpson, 'that Christ both died and rose again. That is proved beyond all question. But, for all that, I am not a Christian, and fear that I never may be; for I have discovered that, after all, the trouble is not in my head, but in my heart.'

1. We sometimes have conversation with young men who lament their loss of spiritual eagerness and religious relish, and the encroachment of a deep weariness in the worship and service of God. Every man knows when that most dangerous season begins. In nine cases out of ten it means that we are morally disordered, we have opened the heart to some insidious Antichrist. We are entertaining some unclean spirit, some secret sin, which is corrupting our spiritual taste, and rendering us incompetent to discern and appreciate 'the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him.' That is the first step in spiritual degradation!

2. But now follow on a step further. A man becomes possessed by this feeling of religious weariness. He loses his relish for the things of God. His prayers are just long yawns. What then? Then he begins sceptically to inquire about the use of prayer. A decision is easily reached that, for him at any rate, there is no use in prayer. But he cannot stop there. He needs must justify himself, and he finds the amplest and most comfortable justification in the more general statement that all prayer is useless, a vain farce, a mere baying at the moon. Along the line of intellectual inquiry some men have reached the conclusion that prayer is useless. Sin begets a deep spiritual distaste and weariness, and this distaste begets a sense of the uselessness of prayer.

3. One further step in this degeneracy will bring us to the conclusion. A man who has lost all belief in prayer to God will speedily pass to the judgment that there is no God to pray to. Here, then, is the range of spiritual degradation. It begins in folly; it ends in unbelief. The man begins by defying God; he ends by denying Him.²

Vice breeds atheism. It is the testimony of poor Robert Burns that

It hardens a' within,
And petrifies the feeling.

It eats the heart out of the man, withers his soul, and destroys his very capacity for God. 'Nothing,' says the late G. J. Romanes, 'is so inimical to Christian belief as

¹ J. Laing.

² J. H. Jowett.

un-Christian conduct. This is especially the case as regards impurity; for whether the fact be explained on religious or non-religious grounds, it has more to do with unbelief than has the speculative reason.

Will you pardon a somewhat unmannerly illustration of this grim truth? One evening, the story goes, in the course of the mess-room dinner at an Indian cantonment, an officer, flushed with wine, took to quizzing the chaplain of the regiment. 'I cannot believe in the Bible, you know.

There are so many things in it which nobody could accept. Jonah and the Whale, for instance: what do you make of that?' The chaplain knew his man. 'Yes,' he retorted, looking him straight in the face, 'there are many things in the Bible which are difficult; but there are other things in it which are quite plain. The Seventh Commandment, for instance.' The quizzing ceased.¹

¹ D. Smith, *Man's Need of God*, 103.

The Doom of the Lost.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. J. AGAR BEET, D.D., RICHMOND.

THE November number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES contains a most valuable article on 'The Doctrine of a Future State,' by Dr. A. Plummer, author of well-known commentaries on several books of the New Testament. He rejects, as not taught in the Bible, and as misleading and dangerous, the doctrine of the endless suffering of the lost; and rejects also, as its underlying and supporting root, the doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul, *i.e.* the endless permanence and consciousness of all human souls. He also calls loudly and justly for a full reconsideration of the whole matter.

This article is an independent and strong confirmation of the teaching of my volume on *The Last Things*. Dr. Plummer's position is precisely my own, namely, that the various writers of the New Testament agree to announce the utter and final ruin of the lost; but do not assert their endless permanence and suffering. This conclusion he supports by expositions and arguments almost identical with mine; especially the references to, and quotations from, Plato, Cicero, Irenæus, Athenagoras, Tertullian, and Augustine. While gladly accepting this welcome confirmation, I shall in this paper supplement it by some account of the history of the discussion, and some practical remarks about the whole subject.

Until a time remembered by many still living, the theory current in all Churches was that the doom of the wicked will be endless suffering as terrible as the excruciating bodily agony caused by fire. This doctrine, common in all pulpits sixty years ago, no one dares to preach now. But comparatively few venture publicly to disown it; and still fewer propound something better in its place.

Yet for many years past there have been voices crying in the wilderness and, with more or less wisdom, denouncing this popular error; *e.g.* a volume by the Rev. E. White, entitled *Life in Christ: Four Discourses*, etc., published in 1846, and a much larger one, with a similar title, in 1875. In these volumes the writer repudiated the above theory; and traced it, as does Dr. Plummer, to the doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul. This protest was accompanied, and as I think weakened, by an attempt to prove the ultimate extinction of the lost; and by some other doubtful arguments. The same teaching was ably set forth by the Rev. H. Constable, M.A., in a work entitled *The Duration and Nature of Future Punishment*, published in 1869, and frequently reprinted.

Soon after Mr. White's larger works, there appeared a small volume entitled *Future Punishment*, by Dr. C. Clemence, who enumerates theories: (1) Universal Restoration, (2) Annihilation, (3) Absolute Endlessness of Suffering and Sin, and (4) his own opinion, namely, that 'In Scripture the Duration of Future Punishment is left Indefinite.' By this last opinion, Dr. Clemence evidently means that the Bible is quite definite about the finality of the doom of the lost, but leaves open the possibility that they may ultimately sink into unconsciousness. Of the other theories, he says: 'We do not accept the first, for it seems to us *against* Scripture; nor the second, for it *distorts* Scripture; nor the third, for it *goes beyond* Scripture.' In other words, he anticipated the teaching afterwards set forth by myself and Dr. Plummer.

Dr. Clemence seems to me to have himself gone 'beyond' the teaching of the Bible, by saying that 'No human spirit reaches the crucial point of its

probation till it has come into contact with the claims of Christ for acceptance or rejection.' He overlooks Ro 2¹⁴⁻¹⁶, where Paul asserts that in the law written in their hearts the Gentiles have a standard by which they will be judged in the Great Day.

In close agreement with Dr. Clemence, except the point just mentioned, I wrote a series of articles published in *The Expositor* for January to June 1890. My volume on *The Last Things* (Hodder & Stoughton) appeared in 1897; the fifth edition in 1905. In this volume, I discussed the teaching of the New Testament on the topic before us; and endeavoured to show that its various writers agree to assert plainly that the punishment of the wicked will be utter and final ruin; that the Synoptic Gospels and the Book of Revelation teach that this ruin will be accompanied by actual suffering; but that nothing in the New Testament justifies the assertion that this suffering or the existence of the ruined ones will be endless. In my view, the precise nature of their doom lies hidden in the secret purpose of God.

Soon after my volume appeared, I was delighted to find that it had been anticipated in a volume by W. E. Gladstone, entitled *Studies Subsidiary to the Works of Bishop Butler* (Clarendon Press). At considerable length he calls attention, as I do, to the confusion caused by the frequent use of the term 'Immortality of the Soul,' sometimes to mean its survival of death; at other times, the endless survival of all human souls: and he protests strongly against this last doctrine as not taught in the Bible, and as being a great disturbing element obscuring and confusing the whole matter of the doom of the lost.

A writer in the *London Quarterly Review*, October 1910, p. 302, says 'that touching future punishment, Mr. Gladstone committed himself to views which are neither catholic nor modern, which can neither claim the authority of Scripture, nor the support of Reason in the highest and best sense of the word. But, on p. 227 (smaller edition) of the above work, Mr. Gladstone utterly repudiates such committal. His suggestion is quoted in full on p. 310f. of my *Last Things*. To the words I have quoted, he adds, 'Let me repeat that my object in this strain of remark is not to suggest the acceptance of doctrines, hardly even to open possibilities. . . . I open one or two doors of mere speculation, to remind other speculators that they are many; that

the prospect which they disclose is not inviting to the cautious and thoughtful mind; and I suggest again and again the question whether there is any safer course than to accept the declarations of the Holy Scriptures which award the just doom of suffering to sin, and leave the sin and the suffering too, where alone they can be safely left in the hands of the Divine and unerring Judge.'

The reviewer says that Mr. Gladstone was not a theologian. Perhaps not. But, in spite of a rather wearisome verbosity, his learned, intelligent, cautious, and plain-spoken treatment of this subject, setting in clear light its main points, and written amid the severe strain of his public life, puts to shame many professed theologians.

Dr. Gore, Bishop of Birmingham, in vol. ii. pp. 210 ff., of his *Practical Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans*, in a note on this subject, mentions and accepts the teaching of the above volumes by Mr. Gladstone and myself; and restates it in concise and accurate language much better than mine.

The root of all the errors against which the above writers protest is the doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul, *i.e.* the endless and conscious permanence of all human souls, which in the latter part of the second century crept unperceived into the Christian Church. That it came from Plato, we learn from Tertullian: see my *Last Things*, p. 214. It was welcomed as a useful deterrent from sin; and has lived on to our days. But it has no vestige of support in the Bible: for no sentence is found there which could not have been written by one who utterly repudiated this doctrine.

Moreover, in the New Testament, 'Eternal Life,' which is practically the same as 'Immortality,' is always spoken of, not as an endowment common to man, but as a reward of the righteous, *e.g.* Mt 16¹⁶, 17, 29, Jn 3¹⁶ 5²⁴, Ro 2⁷ 6²², 23. The future state of the wicked is never once called 'life': it is 'the second death.' Nor throughout the Bible is there any suggestion of the endless permanence of all human souls.

This last negative assertion finds singular confirmation in an interesting volume by Dr. S. D. F. Salmond, first published in 1895 (T. & T. Clark), entitled *The Christian Doctrine of Immortality*. This title, he explains, in the preface to the First Edition, by saying, 'Life, eternal life, the immortality of the man, not the immortality of the

soul, is the message of the Bible, alike in Old Testament and in New' (in the O.T., the only mention of it is Dn 12²; and the references to a life beyond death are few and obscure). Dr. Salmond thus seems to repudiate the popular doctrine. But on p. 487 he quotes with approval a writer who says that the notion of a soul immortal enough to live through death, but not immortal enough to live for ever, is too childish to be entertained.' On p. 497 he asks, 'If man is not inherently immortal, why should the sinful man subsist at all after death?' The answer is easy. God has decreed that, whatever a man sows, this he shall also reap. And, because for this reaping there is not space in the present life, He has decreed that after death comes Judgment, this involving conscious existence at least for a time. But this moral necessity for the survival of the wicked affords no proof or presumption that they will abide for ever in suffering. For we can conceive no moral ends to be gained by endless permanence of evil in this awful form, an abiding blemish on the rescued and glorified universe of God.

Dr. W. N. Clarke, in his very able *Outline of Christian Theology* (T. & T. Clark), p. 192, writes that 'Man is immortal, i.e. the human personality is undying. The spirit is the person, and what is here affirmed is that the human spirit, with its essential powers in which it resembles God, is destined to live on endlessly. A human being will never cease to be a human being.' This assertion he supports by three arguments which refer only to the survival of death, and to the immortality of the righteous. On p. 198, he adds, 'Christ does not affirm in so many words that all men live for ever, but He powerfully teaches it by His attitude and mode of appeal to men.' But of this Dr. Clarke gives no proof or presumption.

That, these two writers, while asserting or assuming the Immortality of the Soul, bring no proof that this doctrine was held by the writers of the New Testament, is strong presumptive proof that it was not taught by them or by Christ. And they illustrate two opposite results of this baseless doctrine: for Dr. Salmond seems to accept the traditional belief of the endless suffering of the lost, while Dr. Clarke seems to cherish a hope of their ultimate salvation. They thus, for very insufficient reasons, ignore another alternative which

the writers of the New Testament leave open, namely, the ultimate extinction of the lost; an alternative less exposed to objection than either of the two alternatives just mentioned.

But Dr. Clarke does well in saying that nothing in the Bible justifies the assertion that the destiny of all, including little children, is fixed at death. On the other hand, we find there no hint of any probation beyond the grave. Of this silence, the frequent appeal to the altogether obscure passage, 1 P 3^{19, 20} 4⁶, so often appealed to as suggesting a further probation, is a clear indication. Such passages are a very unsafe foundation for theological doctrine, or even speculation. On this whole subject, we must admit the limitations of our knowledge. The Sacred Records were given, not to gratify curiosity touching the fate of others, but to show us a path in which we may ourselves walk safely with assured hope. The case of those, in any land, who have not heard fully and fairly the offer of salvation, or were incapable of understanding it, we must leave in the hands of Him who died for all men.

The solemn topic of Retribution beyond the grave is, like all else most worth knowing, surrounded, as to details, by impenetrable mystery. But all that we need to know is absolutely certain. Seen in the light of the imperative majesty of the inborn Moral Sense, which Paul calls 'the Law written in the hearts' of all men, the imperfect retribution of the present life reveals clearly a retribution, within the veil, of reward and punishment. In addition to this earlier revelation, Christ announced for all who put faith in Him and walk in His steps, endless blessedness with God in heaven; and, for all who reject this great salvation, utter ruin, the loss of all that gives worth to existence. His earliest followers believed, and report Him as teaching, implicitly, that this ruin will be final. All this, His heralds are bound to proclaim, in His name. But, as it seems to me, more than this, we have no right to say.

What, above all, is most needed is that our best scholars and theologians take us into their confidence, and give us fully, frankly, and without reserve the results of their own research, and of their most mature thoughts, on this all-important and solemn topic. If they would do this, I believe that we should find, in reference to it, a fair approach to unanimity.

In the Study.

Ask—Seek—Knock.

A VERY Scotch preacher and a very Scotch pastor and a very Scotch poet was the Rev. Thomas Hardy, D.D., who was minister of Foulis Wester in Perthshire from 1852 to 1910. A volume has been published which gives some account of his work in all its variety. Its title is *Preacher, Pastor, Poet* (R. & R. Clark). Here is a specimen of his pulpit work.

[ON A VERY STORMY WINTER DAY.]

My good Friends,—I am surprised and much pleased to find that so many have ventured to face the storm and to gather here to-day. Considering the weather and the shortness of the day, and the probability that we may have more *drifting* before nightfall, I wish to make the sermon at once *short*, and such as can be easily carried home.

‘ASK!’ ‘SEEK!’ ‘KNOCK!’—Mt 7’.

That is the text; and the sermon is *three stories*, thus:—

I. ‘ASK.’—Every Scotch man, woman, and child loves the name of Jeanie Deans. Our own Walter Scott has told her story in his own inimitable fashion; and we have all read it. Well, just call to mind that bit of the story where Jeanie is brought by the kindness of the good Duke of Argyle into the presence of Queen Caroline. The poor, modest, country lassie with her hair snooded, and her tartan plaid over her shoulders, stands abashed and trembling in the presence of this grand lady. But the Duke has told her that if she can interest this lady in her story, she will win the pardon of her sister Effie. It is *that* thought, the thought of ‘puir Effie,’ that nerves Jeanie’s heart. ‘Puir Effie!’ lying in the Edinburgh prison, condemned to be hanged on the gallows tree for child murder! Jeanie’s pure, true, brave heart loved her sister Effie, misguided and sinning as she was. One single word of (slightly?) false swearing from Jeanie’s lips at the trial would have saved Effie’s life. Jeanie would not, even for *that*, swear false. But what on earth was there—not a sin—she would not do for Effie? From Edinburgh to London she had ‘trampit’ wearily but bravely. Her tartan plaid,

and her homely tongue and her honest heart had gained the Duke. And now, to gain the ear—to touch the heart of this great lady! Effie! Effie’s life was maybe hanging on this moment, and the words that might be spoken! And Jeanie was a *wise* beggar. She went about her *asking* in the right way. She lost all thought of ladies and dukes, and of where she was. She never paused a moment to think about what words she would use; but just out, of her full heart, spoke in her own natural, homely phrases about ‘Effie’—‘Effie in the prison! a puir young craitur, no eighteen year auld, that couldna be ca’d fit either to leeve or dee! and a word frae the king’s mouth would save her life! Oh! ma leddy!’ cried Jeanie, as the tears ran down her cheeks, ‘when the hour o’ trouble comes—the hour o’ death—it’s no what we hae dune for *oorsels*, but what we hae dune for *ither folk* that it’s maist pleasant to think on.’ It was thus, with her whole heart’s longing for Effie’s life, in her homely, simple unthought-of words, that Jeanie Deans, at the feet of Queen Caroline, that day *asked* for what she wanted—and she got it.

Dear friends, at the Throne of Grace *ask* you in *that* way, and you will get it.

II. ‘SEEK.’—Here is my second story. It is a true one—as you all know—for it happened in this very place some years ago—amongst these woods and on that hillside. One day the news began to be whispered that ‘wee Jessie’ was missing. Everybody knew the little winsome creature of six years old, with her blue eyes and her flaxen hair, ‘the sweetest thing that ever grew beside a cottage door.’

I need not describe the anxious search to you, everywhere, up the water—down the water—through the wood—along the heathery brae; everybody—young and old—joined it. I doubt not most of you were there. The folk of this place turned out day after day, and went ranging, searching, *seeking* for any trace of the lost darling. They sought and searched as for hid treasure; and she *was* precious in many hearts, the playful little chatterbox with her old-farrant ways, and her bonnie smile! And I needn’t tell the story of her being found—and that we all wondered how—in what way—the kind hand of

God had kept the wee lamb in life day and night—day and night—till that day when there was the cream of joy and wonder as they found her lying, in soft child slumber, among the brackens. Long ago they would have talked about being carried away to 'fairyland.' We knew better. We made a wiser guess, when we thought that surely He whose little lamb she was—He without whose will not a sparrow falleth to the ground—had bidden some gentle, wise ewe-mother on the hillside to yield her shelter and her nourishment to the little helpless, homeless waif. In that long search *all* were joining. All were *seeking*—anxious—oh, most anxious—to find. But do you remember the look that was on the *father's* face? Do you remember how the *mother* went *seeking*?

With something like the eager anxiety of that search, 'seek' *you* for (what is it you need most at this time?) peace—guidance—strength—joy—hope—better, stronger hope of the promised home! 'SEEK' for it as you sought that time for the missing bairn.

III. 'KNOCK!'—this is a story which the late Dr. Guthrie told. Dr. Guthrie of the ragged schools—Dr. Guthrie, the big broad-shoulder'd, broadly-speaking, tender-hearted, humorous Scotsman, that could, better than any man of his time, win tears and laughter, and their hearts, and their money, and their prayers, from any audience he spoke to. No man then could tell a story better.

It was a wild winter night—cold, bitter, sleet washing the pavements. Dr. Guthrie, late that night, had been down in the Grassmarket, where his blessed work lay, called to some poor sick-bed—and returning home he was passing the door of what was then called the 'Night Asylum' or the 'House of Refuge,' or something like that. It had been something grander in its day, for there was a huge, heavy, strong, forbidding gate, with iron nails, and a very formidable big iron knocker high up on the gate. Dr. Guthrie described what he saw, as only *he* could do it—the poor wee ragged, half-naked laddie, with the pale pinched face of hunger, drenched to the skin, the sleet washing his bits of bare feet, and the bit heart breaking in the wee breast in wretched sobs. The doctor told how he drew from the child the outline of a common Grassmarket tale—father in jail, mother drunk, the door 'lockit,' he was seeking shelter for the night. He had 'knockit' with his poor wee bits of knuckles) and *cried*, but

they 'wudna come,' the knocker was 'ow're high,' 'he couldna *grup* it.' 'So I took that knocker in hand (said the friend of the ragged laddies), and I did make it sound through and through that "House of Refuge."' I need not tell you that the laddie got shelter that night, and was in the ragged school next day.

Friends—if we but knew it, we are as much in need as that wee laddie was that night. And, if we feel our helplessness to knock as we would need to knock, doesn't the Bible tell us of a Saviour who will speak for us at the door, and of a Holy Spirit who will touch our poor hearts, and help us to reach the knocker—and to 'KNOCK'?

Recent Biography.

In *Early Letters of Marcus Dods* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.) we have the story told once again of the Scottish probationer's trials. After being licensed by his Presbytery to preach the gospel, Marcus Dods spent six years before any congregation offered him a Call, and so made it possible for him to be inducted and ordained. He was for a short time assistant here, for a short time *locum tenens* there, but for the most of the time he was going up and down the country preaching as a candidate. It was trying enough. But in all trades and professions men have had to wait. Dods did not complain of having to wait. He did not complain of anything unless (almost in a parenthesis) of a certain want of 'luck' which seemed to fall to the lot of the whole Dods family.

And yet there is pathos in the story. For this man had an intense love of literature and could not buy books. 'I must confess to you [his sister, Marcia]. I have bought books lately to the following amount: Owen on the Holy Spirit (folio), 1s. 6d.; Warren's *Blackstone*, 1s. 6d.; a translation of Augustine's *Confessions*, 2s.; but if you knew the amount to which I have been tempted, you would think the self-denial of Francis of Assisi luxurious and indulgent compared to mine. (I got Herbert's poems, too, for 10d.—a nice little copy, not very correctly printed, but that only makes you read the more carefully.)'

More than that, he was never quite sure that he had not made a mistake in choosing to be a minister. 'However, I have made it my almost incessant prayer that I may get work fit for me, whatever it be, and I believe I will: meanwhile I

go on.' And yet he had a message to deliver, and a strong desire to deliver it.

He knew why he failed. 'I did not get on well at the meeting to-night. I am not getting any better at addressing people. I can read to them, and I can write, but it is not in my nature to speak to more than two.' Ah, how well he could speak to two! His friends made suggestions. 'Change your style of delivery.' But he knew that it was a deeper thing than that. 'If I could get a man to put warmth into me, and utterance, in Paul's sense, I would deliver wonderfully. But it vexes me all the more when people talk of my delivery, for I feel all the more deeply that it is not an external thing that art can overcome, but my nature that is not a preacher's nature.'

So here is the pathos. He loved intensely. The best of all the book is the love between Marcus Dods and his sister Marcia. And he would do his work for the sake of those he loved. He had also manliness in him, large, strong, sensitive manhood, and he would give of it ungrudgingly for God's sake and the sake of his fellows—and he could not get a beginning. That is where the pathos lies. That was the source of the suffering. 'Other people with stronger natures may have, doubtless have, endured a great deal more, but I could not have endured more misery than I have done since I began to preach.' And that was after the first two years. 'When I look at the two years as a whole, I cannot but wonder how I have got through so long; the mercy is it comes piece by piece.'

'By the way, if John Gibb is in low spirits, tell him with the kind regards of one who has tried it, to write a sermon on "Rejoice in the Lord alway: and again I say, Rejoice," specially the last clause.'

The life of John Stuart Blackie, written by Miss Anna Stoddart, was published in 1896, that is to say, the year after his death. But in 1869, at the age of sixty, Blackie commenced an autobiography, and within two years completed seven chapters of it. Those seven chapters are now published by Messrs. Blackwood, under the title of *Notes of a Life* (6s. net).

Was it worth while? Certainly not, if the purpose of an autobiography is to give information. For there is nothing whatever about Blackie here that we had not already learned from the *Life*. But if an autobiography shows us the man from

within as a biography shows him only from without, and if the value is great in the degree that the revelation is impartial and illuminating, then it was well worth while to publish this autobiography of John Stuart Blackie.

Blackie was not the fool that perhaps the majority of his countrymen took him to be, and there are no blazing indiscretions in the book. But he was unfettered in thought and speech and action beyond most of his time. And so, besides the criticism of institutions and individuals, which is independent enough to be interesting, while it is never ill-natured, there is a criticism of himself which is at once so full of egotism and so free from it that one is carried right through the book, delighted to listen to a man talking about himself through 340 pages.

There are few good stories, though there might have been many. One of the few is of Dr. Guthrie. It was after what is called in Scotland a Soiree Speech, and it was in Inverness. The audience was unprepared for laughter, for it was the day after the Communion; but they had to laugh. One of them had his revenge. After the speech he came up to Guthrie with an air of kindly and reverential confidence: 'O, Doctor Guthrie, Doctor Guthrie, you have indeed great reason to be thankful, for had it not been for the grace of God, you might have been a great comic actor.'

Lethaby of Moab is the title that has been given to a record by Thomas Durley of the work of Mr. William Lethaby, who spent a large part of his life in Kerak, ministering to the modern and very degenerate Moabites (Marshall Brothers; 6s.) It is not a biography. A biography was perhaps impossible, for lack of materials. And it does not belong to that most objectionable of all kinds of literature, a biography written out of the biographer's imagination. There is no attempt to imagine anything. There is no attempt to write. The biographer has picked portions out of letters and printed them, occasionally introducing them with a word of obvious explanation, such as 'Mr. Lethaby, on the 2nd September, turns the kaleidoscope again,' or 'This possible helper was, unfortunately as it seemed, never discovered, and there was real disappointment'; and so the book is made. Only by perseverance in the piecing of scraps does one begin to realize the heroic life this lonely servant of Christ led, and the marvel of

strong faith in Christ which sustained him. Was it worth while? Was not a valuable life thrown away? So says the Pharisee who wants his reward here and now. Lethaby of Moab laid up his treasure in heaven.

The biography which is prefixed to a selection of sermons by the late Alexander Tomory is brief, but it is singularly happy. Mr. Tomory did his work in Duff College, Calcutta, of which he was appointed Principal a few days before his sudden death. He did his work so well as to make himself a force that was felt throughout the intellectual and religious life of India. But those who knew Mr. Tomory himself had the best of it. And that is the good this short biography does—it brings us all into personal touch with this man of God who had the strength of a prophet of Israel and the grace of a Christian apostle.

The sermons are scarcely superficial enough for the ordinary mind. They suggest more than they express. They beg the reader to think. And ever behind them is the person of the preacher, as if he were one who had fought his doubts and gathered strength, till now every thought has been taken captive to the mind that is in Christ.

The biography has been written by the Rev. W. S. Urquhart, M.A., and Mrs. Urquhart, Mr. Tomory's colleagues in Duff College; and Principal Smith of the University of Aberdeen has contributed a foreword. The title is *Alexander Tomory: Indian Missionary* (Macniven & Wallace; 3s. net).

The Rev. J. Gregory, the author of *Puritanism in the Old World and in the New*, is an ardent admirer of Bishop Phillips Brooks. He believes that in America you can tell nothing about the great preacher that is not known already. But this country does not know. And so he has written a book calling it *Phillips Brooks: A Study for Present-day Preachers* (Stockwell).

Mr. A. K. Langridge, who has written the sequel to the *Autobiography of Dr. Paton: The New Hebrides Missionary*, has not the literary gift which made that book so fascinating. Nor has he the fascinating materials. Yet his book, called *John G. Paton: Later Years and Farewell*

(Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.), will certainly be read by those who have already come under the spell of the great missionary's influence, and they will not be disappointed with it. These last scenes are familiar to many. But here familiarity breeds admiration. In every respect Dr. Paton was greater after sixty than before. His courage was greater, his faith was more dynamic, his actual work done was more. If we read breathlessly the story of the escapes he made in earlier life, and enviously the loving devotion he gave to those who plotted his destruction, we read more calmly but more thankfully here the story of journeys made to America and to Europe in order to plead with the professed followers of Christ to put down the abhorred Kanaka traffic and build a missionary ship. We feel that it was a greater demand on faith to come to Scotland than to stay on Aniwa.

Mr. T. N. Foulis, among other enterprising and successful publishing schemes, has undertaken to issue certain Scottish classics in a style surpassing all previous editions. Among the rest he has published the *Autobiography of Dr. Alexander Carlyle* (6s. net). It is a carefully printed handsome crown octavo and contains thirty-two portraits in photogravure, together with a frontispiece in colour, the frontispiece being a portrait of 'Jupiter' Carlyle himself from a miniature.

Talleyrand the Man (Herbert & Daniel; 15s. net) is the title that has been given to a translation of Bernard de Lacombe's *La Vie Privée de Talleyrand*. The translation is by A. D'Alberti. It has faithfully preserved the confident, somewhat superior, and distinctly gossip-mongering tone of the original. M. de Lacombe had a purpose in describing the private life of Talleyrand. He wanted to show that Talleyrand before he died became wholly reconciled to the Church, and so died a good Catholic. And for that end, it was necessary to show that his life had been—well, not quite so un-Catholic as it has been supposed to have been. M. de Lacombe is not troubled about morality. Always that is a matter of public opinion and nationality. Talleyrand the Frenchman does not set himself the same standard as Gladstone the Englishman. And who will care to say which is the better man? That is the

attitude of the author to morality, public and private. And so he is not concerned to deny improper relations between Talleyrand the bishop and Madame Grand; all he is concerned with is to show that Talleyrand, being a priest, vowed to celibacy, and even a bishop, who should be an example, had to be secularized before he could marry, and had to be reconciled to the Church before he could die.

So the book is a fine unedifying mixture of religion (in the ecclesiastical use of that word) and immorality. The flag of Catholic obedience flies bravely, the standard of life and conduct is quite accommodating. Into the whole history of that beautiful and 'lucky' woman, who fascinated the great Minister, M. de Lacombe has entered without puritanical scruple, even taking the trouble to unearth letters and decipher documents to make it the more accurately doubtful. And all the while he understands that he is fulfilling a duty of the most exalted and exacting kind, a duty he owes to the Church.

M. de Lacombe had special advantages fitting him for his task. Besides what he was in himself, he had access to documents unknown to all previous biographers. In especial, he had in his possession fourteen volumes in which Mgr. Dupanloup, who was the instrument of the final reconciliation and blessing, had collected documents of all kinds concerning his celebrated penitent. These volumes Mgr. Dupanloup bequeathed to M. de Lacombe's father. They have not been altogether unknown to previous biographers, but they have never before been so industriously made use of. The most important document of all has been published *in extenso* at the end of this biography.

There are anecdotes of course. Among the rest there is a version of that popular story about the way to make a religion, which is worth quoting, for this version is probably much nearer the truth than any of the versions that are current in pulpit literature. 'One day at the Institute when Laréveillère in enthusiastic terms was vaunting the beauties of the new ceremonies of Theophilanthropy, Talleyrand interrupted him: "I have but one observation to make," he said gravely. "In order to found his religion Jesus Christ was crucified, and rose from the dead. You should have tried to do as much."'

Virginibus Puerisque.

'Take . . . a little honey' (Gn 43¹¹).

This word was spoken by an old man to his sons when they were setting out upon a long journey. Those stalwart sons of Jacob were going down to Egypt. They would travel for days and weeks together—all the weary way across the desert to Egypt. And the old man said to them, 'Now you will take a great many things with you, but remember this—*Take a little honey.*'

It is good advice for people who are going to travel. If you want to get your friendship and your temper tested, just travel together. I know what it means, for I have travelled for three months with friends of mine—day and night, by land and sea, for so long. There are difficulties and discomforts: people have different tastes, and they want to go to different places and see different things: it is not easy always to keep things sweet. So this is good advice before you travel—'*Take a little honey.*'

But Jacob was thinking of what would happen when they arrived in Egypt. They had been there before, and they had told Jacob about the Governor, the Lord of the land, who was so harsh and severe. And Jacob said, 'When you come again into the presence of the great man, in the present you make, with all the other things you offer, *take a little honey* with you.'

I do not know whether the sons of Jacob saw this meaning in it, but we may. For Jacob was a wise man; he knew how to manage men; and he said, 'When you come to the Governor and ask for corn and an open market, don't be hard and cold and defiant, and distant and proud; be kind and conciliatory, take gentle words, soft words, see that you approach him so as to *win* his favour—*take a little honey* with you.'

Yes, it is a good bit of advice—if you want anything. I don't think I need to tell the children this. You come to your father at night, and you are very, very good; your father is a wise man, and he says, 'What's this? What is it that you're wanting now?'

But really if you want anything from anybody—if you want the best teaching from your teacher, if you want the best friendship from your friend, if you want the best that anybody has to give you, you must be frank, and kindly, and considerate. If you are cold and proud, and distant and hard,

you get nothing. You must win your way.
Take a little honey.

What is the honey? It is good temper. You say that somebody has a sweet temper, and somebody else has a sour temper. It means good words, kind words, the soft answer. You know the difference this makes. It just means *Love*. Patience and sympathy and gentleness, all that is humble, thoughtful, generous, self-forgetful, all these are included in love. Read the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians. See how love is the greatest thing in the world, and the sweetest thing in the world. The honey of life is love. Then *take a little honey* with you.

Thackeray says, 'Life is like a mirror: if you frown at it, it frowns back; if you smile, it returns the greeting.' I think the children may understand this. 'Like a mirror'—You know what happens when you go up to a mirror. If you want to see a smiling face, you must take the smiles with you. If you go up to it with your brows knit, it is the same unhappy face that looks out upon you. You get from the mirror just what you bring to it.

Thackeray says that life is like this. He means that if you go to your lessons singing and smiling, your lessons are ever so much easier. If you go to

your lessons grumbling like a slave, your lessons are all the harder. Even when you go to your play—if you meet your companions in a happy temper, what a grand time you have! But if you go to your games cross and sour, even the play has no pleasure in it, and everything seems to go wrong. You will find how true it is to-morrow morning. Go out in a happy temper, and the whole day is brighter. Begin with a bad temper, and the whole day is spoilt.

Life is like a mirror—if you smile upon it, it smiles on you; if you bring to it frowns, it has only frowns to give you. So take with you the smiles, the sweetness, *take a little honey.*

You will remember this: and perhaps there are some others who will remember this too: and when boys and girls begin to be not sweet but sour, there are fathers and mothers who will look round the table and say, 'Where's the honey? I'll take a little honey, please.'

Think of Jacob and his large family. When he saw his sons packing for Egypt, the old man said:

'Don't forget the honey.'

JAMES RUTHERFORD.

'Men of Galilee.'

BY THE VEN. G. R. WYNNE, D.D., ARCHDEACON OF ACHADOE.

ONE of the chief difficulties in harmonizing the Gospel of St. John and the Synoptic narratives arises from the apparently complete silence of the latter on the subject of any ministry in Jerusalem previous to our Lord's last week. Some, who do not wish to reject the Johannean account of the great deeds and discourses in the Capital, try to lessen or remove the difficulty by assigning all these characteristic narratives and discourses of St. John to the closing period of the ministry. (So Rev. H. L. Wyld, *Contentio Veritatis*, art. 'The Teaching of Christ,' pp. 156, 164.) Those who, like Professor Burkitt, besides accepting St. Mark's Gospel as the principal foundation of the Synoptic story, argue that anything which cannot be fitted in to the outlines of that narrative

should be discredited from an historical point of view,¹ are disposed on that account to reject all St. John's records of a Judean and Jerusalem ministry. Thus two-thirds of the last Gospel are set aside. This rejection of St. John seems to be too serious a matter to be decided chiefly by the silence of St. Mark, or the difficulty of finding place in the Marcan narrative for the Johannean story. It is assuming too much to hold that there is a complete outline of all that is of importance in the brief narrative of St. Mark, or, as seems to follow from it, that our Lord's ministry occupied little more than one year. Were the ministry even prolonged to thirteen or fourteen months, an earlier Feast would in all probability

¹ *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, pp. 103-104.

have led our Lord to the Holy City. Is not the argument from silence misapplied when the non-existence of any reference in the Synoptics to such a visit is taken to imply that it never took place, or that, during His public life, He never went to a Jewish Feast?

St. Luke's story leaves the impression of a longer ministry, but he too is provokingly indifferent to dates, and seems to proceed on the principle that, provided an event is duly recorded, it is of little importance to set it in its true surroundings. On the face of his account, there is no room for an earlier Jerusalem ministry, but it is too much to take for granted, in the presence of narratives so vague as to time and place, that none of the incidents or sayings in this Evangelist had reference to labours in or near Jerusalem.

The title, 'Men of Galilee,' indirectly brings in the question of the relation of the Synoptics to St. John. It seems to give a superficial and *prima facie* support to the theory that there were no Christians made in Jerusalem, because there was no ministry there. Let us look into this.

'Two men' at the Ascension address the band of believers, assembled within two miles of the City of Jerusalem, as 'Men of Galilee,' which is a very pointed hint that they were not in any appreciable degree men of Jerusalem. In other places also, St. Luke represents the body of believers under the same designation. He quotes the crowd on the day of Pentecost as asking, 'Are not all these which speak Galileans?' We must not, perhaps, press the argument from this title here too far, for the fact of the origin of the Christian movement in Galilee, even though many believers were afterwards found in Judea, might well lead to the designation, perhaps the nickname, 'Galileans,' just as the Christians were also called 'Nazarenes.' But, later on, in Antioch of Pisidia, St. Luke quotes St. Paul as saying that Christ was seen after His resurrection many days by 'them which came up with Him from Galilee unto Jerusalem' (Ac 1¹¹ 27 13³¹). St. Luke in his Gospel quotes, 'Of a truth this man is a Galilean' (Lk 22⁵⁵); but this case differs, for it refers, not to creed, but to birthplace and accent. The women at the cross are described as 'the women which came up with him from Galilee' (chap. 13^{49, 55}).

The personnel, then, of the Church in Jerusalem and elsewhere at the earliest period seems, in St. Luke's mind, to be mainly Galilean.

How does this bear on the truth or otherwise of the Johannean narrative? The question does not depend for answer on the further question whether John the Apostle or John the 'Presbyter' of Ephesus is recognized as actual author.

If a considerable number of satisfactory believers resulted from our Lord's ministry in the capital, we should regard it as somewhat unfair and incorrect to give the Christian body the title 'Galilean.'

Does St. John, then, in connexion with his account of the Lord's ministry in Jerusalem, leave on our minds the impression that it was a successful and fruitful ministry which had results comparable with those of the Galilean preaching?

The following is a fair attempt to answer the question.

In Jn 2²³ we read, 'When he was in Jerusalem at the feast, many believed on him; but Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men . . . and knew what was in men.' In other words, these 'believers' were not to be trusted.

In chap. 2²² 4^{1, 2} reference is made to numbers baptized by Christ and His disciples. But this was probably at Aenon or one of the upper reaches of the Jordan. The character of these disciples is not stated.

In chap. 5, the lame man is not a very satisfactory convert; for Jesus says to him, 'Sin no more, that a worse thing come not unto thee.'

In chap. 7⁵, 'Neither did his brethren believe on him.'

In the same chapter, Nicodemus stands out prominently as a bright exception to general prejudice and unbelief.

In chap. 8^{30, 35}, 'As he spake these things, many believed on him; and Jesus said unto them, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth.' A serious doubt of their sincerity is implied in the context, vv. 33, 37.

In chap. 9, the blind man seems to have been a genuine convert; see vv. 35, 38.

In chap. 10⁴², 'Many believed on him there'; but this was beyond Jordan, not in Jerusalem.

In chap. 11⁴⁵, 'Many of the Jews which came to Mary believed on him.' In v. 43, 'If we let him alone, all men will believe on him.' This reference in chap. 11 would seem to imply that the faith was rapidly spreading. But our hopes are damped by the words in the next

chapter (12³⁷), which convey two unfavourable impressions. Speaking of those present at the feast, 'Though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him, that the words,' etc. Again, 'Nevertheless, even of the rulers many believed on him, but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue. For they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God.' This is not the material of which the primitive saints and martyrs were made.

These generalizations by St. John, coming near the close of his history, as the last Passover drew near (chap. 12^{1, 20} 13¹), give the impression that believers of a nominal sort were not few, but that the Apostle did not value their quality as corresponding to their quantity. They were not the kind who could be counted on in the hour of trial. And there is no hint at all in St. John's story of the making of real converts in any number in the capital, certainly not of the calling out of any definite company united in a body of discipleship.

This impression confirms that made by two very important incidents related by two of the Synoptics. The first is differently placed by the first and third. It is the lament of Christ over the Holy City, 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem . . . how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen gathereth her brood . . . and ye would not.' The very different place occupied by this incident in St. Matt. and St. Luke is a clear example of the comparative indifference to the order of events shown by the Synoptics. The other lament over Jerusalem given by St. Luke, containing the words, 'If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things that belong unto thy peace . . . because thou knewest not the day of thy visitation,' closely resembles the former, and is indeed placed by the third Evangelist in the position attributed by the first to the other lament just quoted.

These two touching scenes are only explained, as it seems to me, on the ground of a rejected ministry in Jerusalem, and are not explained by (1) previous rejection of the prophets; (2) unbelief on the part of the Jews of Christ's preaching in Galilee. They refer to efforts made in the City of Jerusalem to win its population by a loving ministry there; and to the failure of these efforts.

This conclusion fits exactly with that last quoted from St. John (chap. 12³⁷). It seems to lend confirmation to the appropriateness of the popular title of the Christian body in those first days, 'The men of Galilee,' for, clearly, only a small contingent from Jerusalem would be present, in those days of danger, at any gathering in a public place so soon after the dispersion of the disciples which took place at the time of the crucifixion.

And now we may pass to another question which bears on the relation of the Synoptic and the Johannine story. Are the Synoptics without any unconscious reference to a ministry in Jerusalem? That they make no intentional or direct reference seems agreed. But a careful examination of their narrative furnishes some perhaps slight but suggestive hints, such as these:—

1. The laments over Jerusalem, already quoted, appear to be almost inexplicable if Christ had not offered to Jerusalem, by previous visits and efforts there, His message of salvation.

2. The reference (Lk 23⁵) that Jesus had 'stirred up the people through all Judea, beginning from Galilee unto this place,' *may be* taken as referring to the events only of the last journey, but will certainly agree better with a wider and more systematic work.¹

3. The reference (Mt 26⁶¹ 27⁴⁰) to Christ's prediction of the destruction of this temple and raising it up in three days, seems to refer for explanation to the original incident in St. John which took place in Jerusalem (chap. 2²⁰). In passing observe a similar interesting link in another place between the same two Gospels. In Mt

¹ The careful reader will observe that SS. Matthew and Mark bring the Lord to the region of Judea beyond Jordan, some indefinite time before His ascent to Jerusalem for the last Passover (Mt 19¹, Mk 10¹). This retirement beyond Jordan, a reason for which is given in Jn 10⁴⁰, seems not quite consistent with a thorough evangelization about that time of the northern villages and 'all the cities of Israel.' If, led by St. Luke, we assume that a very large amount of itinerating was done actually during this last 'ascent,' then the allusion during His trial to His having stirred up the whole country up to the walls of the City, may be fitted into that considerable period. But, seeing that both Matt. and Mark make the period of that journey short and not full of incident, we find it hard to apply the charge to the work done strictly on the journey. And this seems to set the words free to refer to previous missionary labours in the whole region of Northern Judea, and in Jerusalem, not a word of which is found in the two earlier Synoptics. (See various reading in Lk 4⁴⁴, and the remarkable confirmation of its statement in Ac 10³⁷⁻³⁹.)

26³⁰, 'Father, let this cup pass from me'; in Jn 18¹, 'The cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?' We do not know whether the critics have suggested that each of the two references to St. Matt. were purposely introduced into St. John to produce a sense of truthfulness by such unconscious agreement.

4. Previous acquaintance with Bethphage and Bethany, and with some of the inhabitants, seems implied in all the Synoptics in the scene when the colt is sent for. It is assumed that the owner would recognize the claim made by 'The Lord,' who had need of Him. The Lord in this place certainly means Christ.

5. A similar incident is shortly afterwards related—the sending of messengers to the man (he is described as 'such a one' in one of the Gospels) who owned the upper room in Jerusalem. 'The Master saith, My time is at hand, where is the guest-chamber where I shall eat the Passover with my disciples?' It is reasonable to assume that the owner of the house would at once identify Jesus as 'The Master.'

6. The description of the last visit to Gethsemane not only forms another link between the Synoptics and St. John, but suggests with some force earlier acquaintance on the part of 'Jesus and his disciples,' showing that it was not knowledge acquired before the beginning of Christ's ministry.

St. John says, 'Jesus oft-times resorted thither with his disciples' (Jn 18¹⁻³). St. Luke, in closest accord, though using language quite different, says, 'He went, as he was wont, to the Mount of Olives,' *κατὰ τὸ ἔθος* (Lk 22³⁰). Unless these latter words are strained to apply only to the Monday and Tuesday of the then current week, for on Wednesday He did not approach the city, the 'wont' must refer to earlier days in which, on His visits to the city, He loved this sacred retreat. It may be added that the coming of Judas with a band thither, is best explained by St. John's words, which imply that this would be the most natural place to find our Lord at the time.

7. Mt 26⁶, 'When Jesus was in Bethany, in the house of Simon the leper.' According to St. Matt. and St. Mark this visit to an evidently friendly house has no antecedent. But St. Luke and St. John explain it perfectly (Lk 10³⁸, Jn 11¹); and if the 'certain village' of the former be identified with Bethany, as on all grounds seems probable, we have an interesting example of an earlier ministry

in the immediate vicinity of Jerusalem. It does not matter whether St. Luke knew the name of the village or no. If Christ was there, and Luke mentions it, you have all the evidence needed for an earlier ministry.

8. Lk 13⁶. The story of the victims of Pilate reads as if from the point of view of Jerusalem. The victims are called Galileans, as they would be if the conversation were held in Jerusalem; and the accident at the Tower of Siloam, closely connected with the story of Pilate's bloody deed, reads as if the location was well known to the speakers and hearers. The 'atmosphere' of the passage is not Galilean.

9. Why, but from a southern point of view, is it said that the raising of the son of the widow of Nain was 'known throughout all *Judea*'? See also the various reading in Lk 4⁴⁴.

10. The Parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk 10³⁰) has again the flavour of one spoken by a man to whom the scenery of the road from Jerusalem to Jericho is quite familiar.

When it is remembered that, as Professor Burkitt points out, the actual accounts of Christ's ministry occupy not more perhaps than about forty days, there must be a very large amount left out (see Jn 21²⁸). It seems that we are being asked too much when it is said that we cannot regard as safe history anything which cannot be made to find place in the 'proportion' of the Marcan narrative, whatever this word means. This remark is made to introduce a notice of that which seems St. Luke's disproportionate account of Christ's last journey to Jerusalem—his only one during the public ministry, according to the *prima facie* view of the Synoptics.

In St. Mark, to whose narrative we are asked to bring everything as a touchstone of credibility, the last journey seems to begin with chap. 10³², and to lead to its goal when, after no more than fourteen verses, Christ reaches Jericho, and in seven more, Bethphage. In other words, in this, the 'Ur-evangelium,' the whole of this journey occupies but twenty-one verses, and is quite an unimportant part of the public ministry.

Now let us view what seems to be St. Luke's account of the same section of our Lord's life. Either that which appears to be in St. Luke the narrative of a final going up to Jerusalem, with the deliberate purpose of meeting His death, is what it appears to be, reliable in a general way as to times and places, or it is compiled from accounts of more

than one progress through the country, including Galilee, Samaria, and Judea. In the former case, the Lucan narrative is but an expansion of the Marcan; in the latter, it is a silent testimony to the existence of other journeys, including some to Jerusalem, and thus a confirmation, to a certain degree, of the narrative of St. John.

We shall think of Luke's account in each light.

In the first case, supposing this to have been all one journey, it begins just after the Transfiguration and the allusion to the decease which He was about to accomplish (R.V.), in Jerusalem. From this point onward, a striking succession of references is made in ten following chapters to His 'going up to Jerusalem,' as if it was all one and the same progress through the country. Here are the references—

1. Chap. 9⁵¹, 'When he was about to be received up, *he set his face stedfastly to go to Jerusalem.*' The Samaritans for that reason do not receive Him. He must, then, have already passed out of Galilee at this very early stage, and been now some sixty miles north of the capital.

2. Chap. 13²², 'He went through the cities and villages, teaching, and *journeying towards Jerusalem.*'

3. Chap. 13³¹. Evidently He has now passed out of Samaria and is in Judea; and, on the theory of a single journey, from this time on He is in Judea, and Herod's threat to kill Him, and Christ's words about a prophet necessarily perishing in Jerusalem, are spoken apparently within a very few days of His being 'perfected.' It is then, on that occasion, that He is said by this Evangelist to have uttered the touching lament over the City, to which He evidently was very near.

4. Chap. 17⁴. Now, are we not rather startled, after what we have just read, at this later statement? '*As he went to Jerusalem*, he passed through the midst of Galilee and Samaria.' If we are to take St. Luke's story as chronologically correct, this is a great doubling back indeed on His line of march, and a contradiction of His words as to His speedy death. But see more.

5. Chap. 18, 'He took the twelve and said, *Behold we go (are going) up to Jerusalem*, and all things shall be fulfilled,' etc.

6. Chap. 19²⁸. 'When he had spoken these things, he went before them, *ascending up to Jerusalem.*'

On first impressions, all these allusions seem to refer to one and the same final journey in its

successive stages. But we are disposed to question the truth of this impression when we observe how large a section of His public life seems to be involved between the beginning and close of these references to His journeyings, and when we compare this record of many deeds and sayings with the scanty account of the last journey in the other Synoptic narratives. The impression can be felt only after a definite re-perusal of the whole section (Lk 9⁵¹–19⁴¹). The journey, sketched by Mark in fourteen verses, and by Matthew in about the same space (Mt 19¹⁷⁻²⁸), fills eight and a half chapters of St. Luke and is full of matter, descriptive and evangelistic, which involves the passage of a considerable length of time, and the occurrence of many weighty events.

These considerations suggest to us the opinion that St. Luke, though he seems to describe all along but one journey at the close of the ministry, is unconsciously bringing together many incidents carefully collected belonging to more tours than one, some of which may well have been connected with some of the previous ascents to the City mentioned in the Fourth Gospel.

The impression is made on the mind that, while Luke is a conscientious collector of facts, he pays little attention to arranging them in their due places, and, in fact, sometimes reverses the order in which other Evangelists have placed them. If anything like the above be a correct interpretation of the great difference between the first two and the third Evangelists in the description of Christ's last journey to Jerusalem, a slight bridge is thrown over the chasm which separates the Synoptics from St. John.

In other words, we have a means of avoiding the rough-and-ready rule—a rule which tends to discredit the third as well as the fourth Evangelist—that whatever cannot be accommodated with a place in some part of the Marcan narrative is not worthy of credit. This too may be added, that were we certain that no visit to Jerusalem for missionary purposes was ever made by our Lord previous to His ascent to the last Passover, there is not a little in the Synoptics, and especially in St. Luke, which would decidedly raise difficulties of interpretation.

The Church has, since the times of Eusebius, held the view that St. John's is a supplemental Gospel, which, for this reason, does not pretend to take like ground with the Synoptists. It is easy to

see discrepancies where there are only additions. In later times, to this difficulty has been added the other, now universally admitted, that St. John's is a 'tendency' Gospel, in which facts are looked on chiefly for the doctrines which they suggest, and are often coloured by the mind of the theologian to a degree about which people may differ. But this by no means implies that they are not facts at

all, nor does it suggest any reason why, supposing it was known on all hands that our Lord's ministry had certainly been altogether in the northern province, St. John, or the other John who is—after the current fashion—set in place of the Apostle, could not have used, or if the critic wills, invented, narratives to support his theology, *and placed their scene in Galilee.*

Literature.

THE INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY.

It is a sinister sign of the times that one after another the books of Max Nordau are translated into English. If they did not find readers they would not be translated. It is a sinister sign. Not that Max Nordau is immoral. God forbid. His cleanness is a great thankfulness. He is even serious and writes under a sense of real responsibility. But he does not know God. And all his writing is done on the understanding that there is no God to know, and that the sooner we get rid of that superstition the better.

His latest book is translated under the title of *The Interpretation of History* (Rebman; 8s. net). And well translated it is, which, no doubt, helps the cause he seeks to advocate. It is a book of essays, 'The Interpretation of History' being a general title to cover the first three of them. But the most significant essay is the sixth, on 'The Psychological Roots of Religion.' In that essay Max Nordau says that the root of religion is the instinct of self-preservation. This instinct expresses itself in two directions—on the one side in a hunger for knowledge, on the other in a clinging to life. What the clinging to life may do for religion he is not quite sure. Nor is he quite sure what will happen to religion when the hunger for knowledge is rightly understood. But it is easy to see what he hopes will happen. 'It is an open question,' he says, 'whether it will be extinguished when man finally realizes that it is quite useless to seek to know the causes of phenomena, and directs his desire for knowledge to other, attainable ends, and when his instinctive repugnance to the dissolution of his personality subsides, and he learns to think with indifference of his inevitable end.'

What he hopes is that art will then take the place of faith, and concerts, plays, exhibitions, and æsthetic celebrations of every sort, that of the church service.

Now there is nothing in science to lead a man to suppose that the fear of God rightly interpreted will pass away; there is nothing in philosophy; and all history is against it. It is a speculation pure and simple. And it would be hard to find a serious responsible writer speculating with greater harm to his fellow-men.

THE ALCHEMY OF THOUGHT.

Professor L. P. Jacks, M.A., of Manchester College, Oxford, is a master in the art of essay-writing. For some time it was a lost art. The monthly magazine killed it. The new essay that has risen into influence is not so elaborate, and especially is it not so self-important as the essay of Addison or of Macaulay. But it differs wholly from the mere magazine article that so long has held the field, in that it demands careful reading and imparts specific instruction.

There is another respect in which the new essay differs from the old. It deals with deeper things than the outward acts called conduct; it deals with religion. One finds that all that can be usefully said about conduct is soon said, but religion is fathomless and for ever. Professor Jacks, as a Unitarian, deliberately passes by the great historical debates of the Church, but he has a genuine interest in religion, and if his discussions are broad rather than deep, they are at least fashionable and his essays likely to be read.

He calls his book *The Alchemy of Thought* (Williams & Norgate; 10s. 6d. net). This title is

taken from a bold speculation which he has wedged into the middle of the book, and in which he argues that 'the thinker is responsible for the world,' which is the clean contrary to the argument in the essay immediately preceding. But the essay of most daring and least consequence is that with which the volume ends, 'Is the Moral Supremacy of Christendom in Danger?' We say 'of most daring,' because Professor Jacks must know that those who come into contact with other religions and know best their moral worth are unanimous in saying that there is no religion in the world to be compared with Christianity in moral value. And we say 'of least consequence,' because it is not indefinite speculation about abstract Christianity that is to help us; it is encouragement to the individual to be a Christian.

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

Lord Acton has often been used as an awful example of too much learning. It did not make him mad; it made him unfit to write books. At least it was supposed to make him unfit. For the writing of a book demands a fair proportion of ignorance. But the example is losing its terrors. Lord Acton did write books. His great learning only kept him from publishing them. And his executors have been able after his death to make up for that shortcoming.

The new volume contains the *Lectures on the French Revolution* which he delivered in Cambridge as Regius Professor of Modern History, between the years 1895 and 1899 (Macmillan; 10s. net).

The lectures have not quite the literary fervour of the earlier volumes of essays. Did Lord Acton feel that the subject was not altogether to his taste? Certainly he does not let himself go, as he did, for example, in describing the Massacre of St. Bartholomew in one of the earlier volumes. In the case of the Massacre his strong Catholic sympathies made him rise to a memorable denunciation of the politics of the Massacre. But here his political sympathies with the Revolution have no escape. He cannot plant the blame of the excesses that were committed on the Church. The nearest approach to a scapegoat is the Queen. And if one dared criticise a criticism of Lord Acton's, one would say that the estimate he has given of Marie Antoinette is probably untrue and certainly ungallant. Carlyle could not hold a candle to Lord

Acton in knowledge of the literary sources for the history of the Revolution, but he had knowledge enough to base his estimates of character upon. And he had the genius for discovering and disclosing personality. Carlyle's estimate of the Queen is the one that will live.

On the other hand, it is true that we are more anxious now to have all the facts in our possession than to be captured by an impression. And Lord Acton offers us the facts. He seems to possess every letter that was written; he seems to have heard every conversation. Yet he moves easily and we follow his movements without fatigue.

What is it that makes Church History so uninteresting to the lover of the Bible? It is the idea that the moment the Canon closed (or rather the moment that the men passed away who wrote the books of the Canon) direct contact with the Spirit ceased, and the history is henceforth a history of the unaided mind of man struggling to keep a spark of spirituality alive. The Rev. E. A. Edghill has written a book with the deliberate intention of removing that impression. So he calls it *The Spirit of Power as seen in the Christian Church of the Second Century* (Arnold; 5s. net). He has the promise of Christ to rely upon—'Lo, I am with you alway.' But he goes to the history itself. He brings forward evidence to show that there was no break in spiritual vision between the first century and the second, and no decay of spiritual life.

The legends that gathered round the Infancy of our Lord in the early centuries have been retold in the most pleasing way by Eleanor Hammond Broadus, and published by Messrs. Appleton, under the title of *A Book of the Christ Child* (6s.). The volume is prepared for presentation. It contains sixteen illustrations in colour from the Great Masters, and every page has an artistically illuminated border.

If there are those who feel that the 'natural' explanation of the conversion of St. Paul has yielded all that it has to yield and there is still something left to be explained, we commend for their consideration a volume written by the Rev. Reginald J. Fletcher, D.D., Preacher of Gray's

Inn. Its title is *A Study of the Conversion of St. Paul* (Bell; 3s. 6d. net).

It is the day of small books, and Cambridge leads the way. The *Encyclopædia Britannica*, it is true, is not a small book, but the *Encyclopædia Britannica* is only a child of adoption. The legitimate offspring are the 'Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature,' and similar condensations and compendiums. The Manuals are sold at 1s. net each. They are good value for the money. Professor F. B. Jevons writes the volume on *The Idea of God in Early Religions*; Mr. L. Doncaster that on *Heredity in the Light of Recent Research*; and Professor J. W. Judd that on *The Coming of Evolution*. The last named is the best short account we have seen of the history of Darwinism.

Messrs. T. & T. Clark have published another volume of *The Great Texts of the Bible*. It contains the Great Texts of the Gospel according to St. Mark (10s.).

The Church of Scotland Year-Book for 1911 has been issued (R. & R. Clark; 6d.). Perhaps one-half of its contents are found also in the Scottish Church and University Almanac. The rest might possibly be gleaned from bluebooks. But here it is all in convenient order, and some of it is even set forth with literary skill.

Another volume has been published of Mr. J. Brierley's articles in *The Christian World*, and under another good title, *Life and the Ideal* (James Clarke & Co.; 3s. 6d. net). But the title is not only attractive, it is descriptive. Every essay has to do with some ideal of life—Sin and the Ideal, Prayer and the Ideal, Failure and the Ideal. More than in any previous volume there is unity, and unity gives strength here as elsewhere.

The Rev. E. Digges la Touche, M.A., has had success in fighting his own doubts, and, further, somewhat significant success in slaying the doubts of other men. In the whole process he has carved out a statement of what Christianity is, and offers it as a book of evidences under the title of *Christian Certitude: Its Intellectual Basis* (James Clarke & Co.; 3s. 6d. net). Mr. la Touche is a little uncertain as to the findings of the higher critics; on all other questions he is convinced and

convincing. The Bishop of Durham commends the book without reserve.

Two more of the volumes dealing with Modern Religious Problems have been issued: *The Historical and Religious Value of the Fourth Gospel* by Professor Ernest F. Scott, and *The Founding of the Church* by Professor B. W. Bacon (Constable; 1s. net each). The choice of these authors tells at once that the series is to represent the scholarship of the day, and even its advanced scholarship.

Messrs. Dent have published a volume on *The Art of Living*, for the Moral Education League (2s. 6d. net). It contains the illustrations that were used by Dr. Foefster in his book on *The Moral Teaching of the Young*. For the translator, Miss Ethel Peck, has found that there is no better educator than the anecdote. It is not at all unlikely that the book, which has had a great circulation in Germany and German-speaking Switzerland, will now reach a considerable circulation in this country also.

Mr. Frowde has published the second part of *The Companion Bible* (4s. net). This Bible, it may be remembered, gives the text of the Authorized Version in one column, and notes in the next. Each of the four volumes of which the whole work is to consist will also contain a number of appendixes. In this second volume there are ten appendixes. The text of the Authorized Version, with these notes and appendixes, form the contents of the volume. It may be a question whether it was wise to use the Authorized Version for a student's edition, but it suits the conservative nature of the notes very well. So conservative are the notes and appendixes that if they are right the great bulk of the Biblical scholarship of our day has been wasted labour. And yet there is a sense in which the book is up to date. In 2 K 15²⁷ the reign of Pekah is given as twenty years, upon which the following is the note: 'The Assyrian inscription shows only four years. But why is writing on stone always assumed to be correct, and on parchment always wrong? There were two chronological mistakes on the Duke of Cambridge's monument erected in Whitehall, London, which were the subject of a correspondence in the London newspapers of that date. The Duke died in March 1904. On the coffin-plate of

King Edward VII., his death is put as occurring in the ninth instead of in the tenth year of his reign.'

In *The Day of the Country Church* (Funk & Wagnalls; 4s. net) there is much that belongs to America; there is also something that is applicable everywhere. The country church deserves some attention for its own sake, and some for the sake of the town church. Do not the town churches tell us that their best workers come from the country? If religion dies in the town, it will not survive in the country—the towns accepted Christ first. But if religion is neglected in the country, it will die the sooner in the town. The Rev. J. O. Ashenhurst is keenly alive to the danger of making churches 'pay their own way.' He sees that on that plan the end is not far off.

The great Missionary Conference held in Edinburgh in 1910 has sent its sound through the wide world. Two results are evident. First, an uneasy feeling in the rationalistic camp, the evidence of which may be seen in the *Agnostic Annual* and in Sir Hiram Maxim's valiant proposal to found an anti-missionary society (when the funds are forthcoming). Next, an increase in good missionary literature, and especially literature designed to educate the indifferent.

To this kind of literature a notable contribution has been made by Dr. Henry Clay Mabie. Its striking title is *The Task Worth While* (Philadelphia: Griffith & Rowland Press; \$1.25). It is an historical survey, but on a new plan. The first chapter gives the reason for the existence of the Christian missionary; then follows a chapter on the providence that has been present in the history of missionary effort; and to this succeeds a chapter on the continuity of the missionary passion. Thus the work proceeds in order till it reaches the eternal 'Now' of missionary obligation.

In lively language and active interest the Rev. R. L. Gales tells the story of a country parson's life among the rich and poor of his parish. *Studies in Arcady* (Herbert & Daniel; 5s. net) is a sweet title. But the salt and even the sour are not far off. 'The poor ye have always with you'—but need they be always so poor? And especially, is it inevitable that they should be so soulless? They have been whipped into it (literally), says Mr. Chesterton, and Mr. Gales

agrees that it is so. The chapters on the poor in the parish make serious reading. But there are lighter chapters also. There is even loud laughter sometimes. For this vicar, like all good Shepherds, can listen to a good story, and can tell one.

Sin as a Problem of To-day (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.) is a subject which no one can handle more capably than Professor James Orr. He knows as a theologian the history of the doctrine of sin. He knows as an apologist the present practical danger of false thinking about sin. And he is at once patient and decided. He does not hesitate for a moment to denounce wrong theories as well as bad practices; but he remembers our frame. There is no answer to a book like this. There is nothing left but repentance and reformation.

Messrs Macniven & Wallace have issued *The Scottish Church and University Almanac for 1911* (1s. net). Does everybody know how comprehensive and convenient is this record of the ecclesiastical and university life of Scotland?

Messrs Marshall Brothers have published a new and revised edition of Mr. John Jackson's *History of the Mission to Lepers in India and the East*, from 1874 to 1910. The title is simply *Lepers*.

The most popular book ever written on Palestine was Thomson's *The Land and the Book*. It was issued in this country by Messrs. Nelson many years ago. Some time afterwards an enlarged edition in three great handsome volumes appeared. But the three-volume edition never 'caught on.' The single-volume edition, however, went out of print, the coloured plates having perished, if we are not mistaken, by fire. Now, however, Messrs. Nelson have issued a new edition. It is in one volume and follows the first edition, except that recent discoveries have been taken into account and a revision made in the light of them. The size is a convenient quarto, and the coloured illustrations are finer as well as more numerous than in the original edition (6s. net).

An account has been published of the travels of the late Mr. R. C. Morgan, of the firm of Messrs. Morgan & Scott. *Glimpses of Four Continents* is the title (Morgan & Scott; 2s. 6d. net). They are the

glimpses obtained by a man who saw the world as lying in darkness and looked for the Coming to Judgment. And yet he enjoyed his travels, took pleasure in the places and the people, fed the pigeons at St. Mark's, and praised the Lord for His goodness. The book is full of good photographs and pleasant people.

The Dean of Canterbury seems to be the most conspicuous friend of the Protestant Reformation left to the Church of England. And he recognizes his responsibility. The great purpose of his life is to persuade the Church to a reconsideration of the debt it owes to the Reformers and the good it has derived from the Reformation. In his latest book, *Principles of the Reformation* (Nisbet; 5s. net), he publishes three papers, one on the First Principles of Protestantism, one on the Course of Protestant Theology in the Sixteenth Century, and one on the Primary Principles of Luther's Life and Teaching. And to these he adds three short addresses on certain pressing problems of Church life—the Gospel and the Remission of Sins, the Sacrificial Aspect of the Holy Communion, and the True Authority in Matters of Christian Faith and Practice.

Dr. A. T. Pierson is not the author to go to for a critical introduction to the study of the Bible. But if we separate the critical from the devotional, and seek the latter study only, then his new book may serve us very well. It is a book of 'Rules and Methods of Bible Study,' by one whose occupation and only interest in life is the study of the Bible, so that he is bound to have something to say that will be good for edification. Every method of Bible study that has ever been practised is described in the book, not omitting even the humorous study of the Bible. The title is *Knowing the Scriptures* (Nisbet; 5s.).

Messrs. Nisbet have issued *Nisbet's Church Directory and Almanack* and *The Church Pulpit Year Book for 1911* (each 2s. net). The Directory is improved by the new method of arranging the benefices. The Year Book looks always as if it contained skeleton sermons and no more. But some of the sermons have the breath of life in them, and some of them contain an apposite anecdote or other telling illustration.

It seems late in the day for an elaborate criticism of Schmiedel's article on the 'Resurrection Narratives' in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. But the reading of a single chapter of this book on *The Resurrection Narratives and Modern Criticism*, by Thomas James Thorburn, D.D., LL.D. (Kegan Paul; 6s. net), will dispel all doubt as to the wisdom of publishing it. For Dr. Thorburn has criticised Schmiedel's theory with a scholarship which commands respect, with a temper which puts most scholarly critics to shame, and with a popular gift of exposition which brings the actual situation home with clearness to the mind. Moreover, he has not confined his attention to Schmiedel, but has discussed and demolished every negative theory that has ever yet been proposed. We may be no nearer belief in the Resurrection, for that is of the will, but we cannot believe in any explanation that denies it.

Miss Laura Ella Cragin's method of teaching the Old Testament is to set up a great picture in front of the children—Doré's 'David Mourning for Absalom,' Schopin's 'David Playing before Saul,' and the like—and while the children's eyes are on the picture, their ears receive the story in the teacher's quiet simple narrative. That narrative and the whole method will be found in *Old Testament Stories for Little Children* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net).

In eight sermons the Rev. Cleland Boyd McAfee, D.D., of Brooklyn, gave his congregation an exposition of the Sermon on the Mount, and was encouraged to give it to the world. He calls the book *Studies in the Sermon on the Mount* (Revell; 2s. 6d. net). There is no display of gifts either of scholarship or of interpretation. Indeed, there is occasionally a display of their absence, as when we are told, 'The Greek word for dog is Kunikos, and you see in that our word cynical, if you look at it carefully.' But a real effort is made to show that the Sermon on the Mount is meant to be carried into our present daily life.

When the Rev. E. H. Archer-Shepherd, M.A., published a book on the Higher Criticism, the *Church Quarterly* said that he 'left little that was useful unsaid.' This fired his ambition. 'I have tried,' he says, 'in this work to deserve higher praise. I hope that I have left *nothing* that is useful unsaid.' And yet the new work is on the

evidence for the Resurrection. Its title is *The Nature and Evidence of the Resurrection of Christ* (Livingtons; 2s. 6d. net). Now, to be quite candid, as all good friends ought to be, we think that Mr. Archer-Shepherd has left quite a number of things unsaid. But it is of no great consequence. For he has taken the right way with the evidence for the Resurrection. He has shown us that it is not a question of evidence but of attitude.

Professor D. J. Medley, M.A., who writes the fourth volume of Canon Hutton's series, 'The Church Universal,' clearly holds that it is the business of a historian to discover and record the facts of history. This is one of the smallest volumes of the series—*The Church and the Empire* (Livingtons; 4s. 6d. net). It is also one of the fullest. There are no digressions and no philosophical discussions. These things happened, says Professor Medley; it is not for me to say what brought them about, or what they led to.

We should preach on topics as well as on texts. For staying power there is no sermon like the expository. But for interest a man must preach what is given him to preach, and sometimes it is a topic which the newspaper or the contact of life has compelled him to consider. A volume of pulpit topics treated in a quite refreshingly original and natural manner has been published by Mr. Robert Scott. The author is the Rev. W. D. M. Sutherland, Landsborough United Free Church, Saltcoats. The title is *Ideals for the Christian Life* (2s. 6d. net.).

The same publisher pursues his 'Preachers of To-day.' The new volume is *The Fear of Things*, by the Rev. John A. Hutton, M.A. (3s. 6d. net.). Though the title seems to be taken from the second sermon—'They feared as they entered into the cloud'—it is applicable to all the book. Mr. Hutton, using 'fear' in its grand sense, urges the place of it and the need of it at every step we take in life. It is the consecration of all life. For it is the recognition of the presence of God in every act of life, not as an immanent influence merely, but as reconciled through the Cross and to be addressed as Father.

The latest addition to the 'Contemporary

Science' series (Walter Scott Publishing Company) is a volume entitled *The Jews: A Study of Race and Environment* (6s.). It is a volume of nearly six hundred pages, closely printed and furnished with all the necessary apparatus of study—an admirable bibliography, an excellent index and carefully compiled contents. It is a study of the Jews, not historically but geographically and anthropologically. And at every step, taken with strict scientific accuracy, the text is illustrated by portraits. There are no fewer than a hundred and forty-two portraits in the volume.

The Jews alone of all the races on the earth can be isolated for such study as this is. If here and there 'mixed' marriages make the isolation imperfect, Mr. Fishberg, the author of the book, holds his hand. Where there are no mixed marriages he is able to do his measurements and draw up his statistics with confidence. He dislikes mixed marriages in the interest of science just as heartily as the Church or the Synagogue dislikes them in the interests of religion.

And the results of his investigations are remarkable and even startling. What does the 'genius for religion,' plainly possessed by this people, really mean? Why is morality so evidently an attitude? The volume deserves the study of the follower of Christ not less surely than of the student of science; but he must undertake it with open-mindedness and in a spirit of contrition. Here, for example, is a sentence to consider at this time: 'The more devoted that Jews are to their religion, the less apt are they to commit suicide.'

Mr. R. Henderson Smith has published *The Monthly Visitor for the Year 1910*, at the office, 68 Hanover Street, Edinburgh (3d.). Besides its own deliberate use, which it never served better, preachers should observe the use of it for incident and anecdote.

The S.P.C.K. publishes a series called 'The Romance of Science' series. Each volume is enough for an introduction to its subject; and each contains illustrations for the teacher of religion or ethics. The latest issue is *The Pressure of Light*, by Professor J. H. Poynting (2s. 6d.).

Notes on the Gospel and Revelation of St. John, by Hilda, Baroness Deichmann, has a title-page of promise. For Hilda, Baroness Deichmann, is

a granddaughter of Baron Bunsen on the one side, and of Samuel Gurney the Quaker on the other side. And the promise is deepened by the preface. There we are told that the 'conflicting opinions' of these two strains of heredity 'were but a school for the revelation of the inner meaning of all which by the grace of God has been vouchsafed to me, an ignorant woman, during these last years.'

But the promise is not redeemed. That is to say, it is not redeemed to our mind. It is not that we have been cut off from all interest in the book by the statement that the 'Notes' contained in it 'were given in automatic writing by Raphael, a messenger of God.' We have taken the book on its merits. So far as we can see there is nothing in it that is not found in the ordinary commentaries. If Hilda, Baroness Deichmann, never read a commentary or any description of the life of the Jews in the time of Jesus, then this volume is a wonder, and calls for some explanation. But we should have been more impressed by it if it had told us something we did not know already. How beautiful a book it is in outward appearance. The Theosophical Publishing Society, who have issued it for the author, have bound it in white

parchment, with silver lettering and purple edges (5s. net).

One of the most serious of the difficulties which confront the advocate of Christianity to-day is the fact that words which have hitherto denoted one thing are now deliberately used to denote the very opposite. The word 'divinity,' the word 'deity,' and now also the word 'unseen' are suffering this abuse.

Thus a book has just been published called *Social Idealism*, written by R. Dimsdale Stocker, and published by Messrs. Williams & Norgate (3s. net). In that book 'our outlook,' to use the author's own words, 'is directed exclusively to Man' (with a capital, of course); and yet he proceeds to say, 'Our supreme trust lies in the Unseen.' He then goes on to explain 'the Unseen' as 'the Social Organism, the *invisible*, but all-potent, factors of personality, individuality, will, society.' And the capitals and italics are all his own. We sympathize with the object of the book, which is to encourage us to live a better life than heretofore. But it is misleading and worse to use words which identify that object with faith in God.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., LITT.D., OXFORD.

Yahweh and Jerusalem.

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (xix. II, p. 525) I have already mentioned that in the Babylonian tablets of the Kassite period (1400 B.C.) the feminine Yautum is found by the side of the name of the male god Yaum or Yau, and that as Yau corresponds with the Hebrew יהו and יה, so Yautum would correspond with יהוה. The date to which the name of Yautum goes back can now be extended to the age of the Khammu-rabi dynasty, since in the tablets of that period recently published by Professor Ungnad we meet with the Amorite or West Semitic proper name Beli-Yautum, 'My lord is Yautum.' This makes it probable that the name Beli-yatum, found in the same tablets, which I

have hitherto regarded as a hypocoristic abbreviation, really represents Beli-Yautum.

Professor Clay in his suggestive book *Amurru*, p. 89, states that on two tablets, one dated in the reign of Rim-Anum of Larsa and now in the Pierpont Morgan collection, the other dated in the reign of Samu-abi, the founder of the Khammu-rabi dynasty, and now at Berlin, the name of Ya-wu-um interchanges with that of Uras, the god of Dilbat (or rather Dilmu), the modern Dailem. Uras is ideographically written IP, his female counterpart being NIN-IP. Nin-ip was borrowed from the Sumerians by the Semites, among whom she became a male deity, just as Istar became a male deity among the Semites of Southern Arabia and Moab. As Uras is Yawum or יהו, it is impossible

to compare Nin-ip with יהוה, where the form of the word is feminine though it denoted, not a goddess, but the God of Israel. Thus we have:

Masc. Uras (IP) = Yawum, יהו;

Fem. NIN-IP = Yautum, יהוה;

Nin-ip and Yautum alike becoming male divinities among the Semites.

In Assyria Nin-ip was usually known as Mas or Masu, 'the leader,' of which Biru, 'the illustrious,' was given as a synonym, Biru being elsewhere explained (*C.T.* xviii. 7. 39) as equivalent to *erradu*, 'hero.' Biru, more exactly Bîru, as I pointed out some years ago, takes the place of Nin-ip in certain of the Assyrian letters published by Professor Harper. Among the Semites of Babylonia, on the other hand, the god was called Ninip, where Professor Clay has convinced me that the third letter must be read *n* and not *r*. What the name precisely represents, however, is uncertain; on the whole, *En-nam(m)asti*, 'Lord of mankind,' seems to me the most probable. That the Sumerian name Nin-ip continued to be used along with the Semitic title of the god is shown not only by the name *Nvéš* met with in a Cilician inscription, but also by the title applied in the Talmud (*Yoma*, 10a) to Nippur, the city of Nin-ip, namely, Nûphar Nînpî. Nin-ip is identified with the star Sakkut, who, as Schrader has shown, is termed the 'king' and 'god' of the Israelites by Amos (5²⁶). As the destroying war-god he was called Sar-sarra (*C.T.* xxiv. 40. 62), and Sar-sar—a title also applied to Ea (*C.T.* xxiv. 14. 44)—is described as 'the god of the Suti' (Sheth), or Amad Semites, like Amurrû, 'the Amorite god' (*C.T.* xxiv. 42. 93). Sar-sar, indeed, was one of the names given to the land of the Amorites (*W.A.I.* ii. 51. 19). It may be added that Nin-ip was especially known as 'the god of the oracle' (*piristi*), while Mas and his wife Zamama were collectively called Astûwinu by the Amorites (*W.A.I.* ii. 57. 19).

Now in the Tel el-Amarna tablets the name of Nin-ip, 'the Temple of Nin-ip,' occurs twice. In one instance the Amorite king Ebed-Asherah said to have mustered his forces in the temple of Nin-ip before attacking Gebal; in the other instance it is the name of a city near Jerusalem. In one of his letters Ebed-Kheba, the king of Jerusalem, refers to 'the city of the mountain of Jerusalem whose name is Bit-Nin-ip' (KNUDTZON,

290. 15, 16). Other Assyriologists prefer to translate 'a city of the land of Jerusalem,' but, as Dr. Pinches remarks, this would require the insertion of *isten* before *alu*, 'city.' Moreover, the rendering is excluded by the usage of the Jerusalem letters. Elsewhere in them 'land of Jerusalem' is always written *mat ali*, *mat ali* . . . KI or *matât ali* . . . KI, while we have, on the other hand, *sad Sakmi*, 'the mountain of Shechem,' and (in KNUDTZ. 287. 61) *sad Uru-Salim-KI*, 'the mountain of Jerusalem.' Whether the ideograph KUR is interpreted *matu*, 'land,' or *sadu*, 'mountain,' is, however, a matter of indifference; the sense is the same in either case. The territory of Jerusalem did not extend beyond the mountainous region in which it stood. Hence Ramses III. at Medînet-Habu calls it Qau-n-Salm(a), 'the highlands of Salem.'

What was the Canaanitish name of this Nin-ip whose temple was built in the immediate neighbourhood of Jerusalem? Nin-ip, it must be remembered, was a war-god; his Canaanitish correspondent, accordingly, must have been a god of battles also. Hence it was that the Amorite forces of Ebed-Asherah were ordered to assemble in his temple. Now in *C.T.* xviii. 8, col. a, we are told that *ba'ulu* was the 'Amorite' word for 'prince,' and that other synonyms of it were *bîru*, [*bâ*]ru, and (AN) Ya-u, 'the god Yau.' We have already seen that Bîru was a name of Nin-ip. As for *Ba'ulu* or Baal, the same form of the word is found in the names of places in Canaan on monuments of the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty.

That the name of Yau was known in Canaan before the Israelitish conquest is no longer incapable of proof. As is well known, in the inscriptions of Sargon the name of the same king of Hamath is written Yau-bi'di and Ilû-bi'di, and in the Assyrian lexical tablets Yau is stated to be the equivalent of *ilu*, 'god.' We have exactly the same parallelism in Jos 10³, when in place of the Hebrew (Ye)ho-ham the Septuagint has El-am as the name of the king of Hebron. The writer of one of the cuneiform tablets found at Taanach was a certain Akhi-yawi, and in view of the discovery of the form Yawum by the side of Yaum in the Babylonian documents of the Khammu-rabi age, I can no longer refuse my assent to the opinion of Professors Hrozný and Rogers that in Akhi-yawi we have the representative of the Hebrew Ahijah. In a list of militia

furnished by the inhabitants of Taanach and its neighbourhood, we further find the name of 'Yiwi-banda the king,' where Yiwi may stand for Yawi. The reduction of the final *u* to *i* is an example of the general phonetic law of which the first syllable of Jerusalem for Uru-Salim is another example. This thinning of *u* or *w* to *i* or *y* was one of the marks of Hittite influence upon the language of Canaan, as has been made clear by the Cappadocian and Boghaz-Keui cuneiform tablets.

Uru-Salim is Babylonian, and proves that the city was founded by the Babylonians. It was, in fact, built to protect the route to the naphtha springs of the Dead Sea district, which were of special value in the eyes of the Babylonians who used the naphtha, not only for mixing with their mortar, but also for lighting and heating purposes. The name means 'the city of (the god) Salim.' In Assyro-Babylonian Salim usually appears as Sulmu, but the Sumerian Silim (with the first syllable affected by the law of vocalic harmony) implies a Semitic Salim from which it was borrowed. The divine name AN DI-*mu*, therefore, which occurs on a seal may be transcribed either Sulmu or Salimmu; the personal name, however, A-bu-Salim, which is met with in the Cappadocian tablets, settles the question as regards the Abrahamic age and the western portion of the Semitic world. In Assyria also the question is settled by the name of one of the early High-priests of Assur, Salim-akhum, 'Salim is a brother,' which corresponds with Hebrew names like Eliab or Joab. In Hebrew Abu-Salim, 'a father is Salim,' has become Ab-salom, 'father of peace,' for the same reason as that which has caused the change of Ish-Baal into Ish-bosheth. This makes it probable that in Is 9⁵, where the Messiah is called 'the Prince of Peace,' there is a reference to the old name of Jerusalem, the cuneiform equivalent of 'king of Jerusalem' being *sar* (Uru) *Salim*, 'king of (the city of) Salim.' Isaiah was a student of the older literature of the country (see Is 16¹⁸), and we know that in the reign of Hezekiah under whom Isaiah lived, the scribes of the royal library were employed in re-editing or translating earlier texts (Pr 25¹).

The god Sulmu was also known as Sulmanu, a Babylonian form which seems to have been pronounced Salmanu or Salimanu in Assyrian. The name is familiar to us in that of Shalmaneser, Ass. Sulmanu-asaridu (or Salimanu-asaru), 'Shalman is

leader,' of which we have an abbreviated form in Salamanu, the name of the Moabite king in the time of Tiglath-pileser IV. as well as in the Shalman of Hos 10¹⁴. In W.A.I. iii. 66, Rev. 40, we are told that 'Sulmanu the fish' was the god of the city Kar-Silim, thereby identifying him with the fish god Ea, the Babylonia Creator, and on a sea from Arban on the Khabur we find the name of Sulmanu-nunu-sar-ilâni, 'Shalman the fish is king of the gods.' In the Greek inscriptions of Shêkh Barakât in Northern Syria, Selamanês forms one of a triad with Madbakhos and the goddess Simi (Seimios). That both the shorter and the longer forms of the name were known at Jerusalem we may conclude from the fact that the Septuagint reads Salômôn (Solomon) instead of the Hebrew Shêlômôh, implying that both Salimmu (Shêlômôh) and Sulmanu, Salimanu (Salômôn) were found in the Hebrew MSS. Shalman is found in a Phœnician inscription from Sidon.¹

We can now understand why it is said (2 S 12²⁶) that Nathan changed the name of David's son Solomon to Jedidiah 'because of the Lord.' The name would originally have been Yadud-Salim (Yedid-Shelomoh) with a possible reference in the first element to the name of David, of which the prophet of Yahweh would naturally have disapproved. In spite of Nathan, however, the non-Jewish population of Jerusalem was too numerous to allow his form of the name to survive; the name of the ancestral god of Jerusalem was too deeply rooted among them to be displaced by that of the Jewish conqueror, and it was not until the temple of Yahweh had been erected in the city of Salim that the ancient god of the city was compelled to retreat. Even in Jewish history the successor of David is known as Shelomoh or Solomon.

It is clear from 2 S 24^{16, 18, 25} that the temple of Solomon was not built on the site of an older temple or high-place. The site of the temple of Salim must therefore be looked for elsewhere on the Temple-hill. Salim was known there as El Elyon, 'the Most High God' (Gn 14¹⁸). This would correspond with an Assyrian *ilu elênu* or *elû*, and it deserves notice that *tizqaru elû*, 'the highly exalted one,' was a title of Nin-ip. What was the relation that existed between Nin-ip and Salim?

As we have seen, 'the city of Bit-Nin-ip' was in

¹ Clermont-Ganneau, *Recueil d'archéologie orientale*, ii. pp. 1 sqq.; *Études d'archéologie orientale*, ii. pp. 36, 48.

the mountain of Jerusalem. Nin-ip, we have also seen, was Yau, and Mr. Tomkins was probably right in holding that the town of 'Batia,' which is mentioned by Thothmes III. in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, represents a Hebrew Beth-Yah. On the other hand, in Gn 22¹⁴, we have a saying quoted by the prophet, as I have shown elsewhere, is a transcription of a cuneiform original: *ina sad Yau urtu*, 'in the mountain of Yahweh is the oracle.' This mountain is identified by the Chronicler (2 Ch 3¹) with the Temple-hill. Whether this is right or not, Har-el, 'the mountain of God,' occupies the place in which we should expect to find the name of Jerusalem in the list of cities in the south of Palestine conquered by the Egyptian king Thothmes III. That Har-el is the 'mountain of Yahweh' of Genesis is obvious when we remember that Ezekiel (43¹⁵) calls the altar of the temple in the new Jerusalem Har-el, with a reminiscence, perhaps, of the fact that the altar of the great temple of Bel-Merodach at Babylon was known as Du-azagga, 'the holy mountain.' Har-el has been changed into Ariel in the second half of the verse (Ezk 43¹⁵) through the influence of the well-known passage in Is 29¹⁻², where, however, the name is applied to the City of David on Mount Zion, and not to the Temple-hill. We have learnt from the Moabite Stone, where the Arel of Dodah and the Arels of Yahweh are mentioned, that they were armed champions attached to the service of a deity like the *qarradî ilâni*, or 'champions of the gods,' in Assyria; hence Isaiah calls the city of David the 'champion' or defence of the Temple and Temple-hill, and declares that though it shall be besieged and distressed it shall nevertheless be to the Lord 'as a champion.' In the text of Ezekiel the Ariel or Arel would be entirely out of place. As we have seen above, Biru is given as a synonym of *qarradu*, 'champion' or 'hero.' The city of David stood on the site of the

Jebusite fort, from which it was necessary to climb up into Jerusalem itself (2 S 24^{18, 19}). It was only after the fort was taken that Joab managed to ascend through a *zinnôr*, or rock-tunnel, into the city (2 S 5⁶⁻⁹, 1 Ch 11⁶). The position had been so strong that its defenders believed 'the blind and the lame' alone were sufficient to protect it. That this, however, was the actual origin of the saying, 'The blind and the lame must not enter the temple' (2 S 5⁸), is doubtful, since the Babylonian ritual texts show that a similar rule existed in Babylonia, where a blind or maimed person was not permitted to perform the priestly offices. But the connexion of the saying with the boast of the Jebusites makes it clear that the writer of the Books of Samuel believed that the Jerusalem which was captured by Joab and his followers was where the temple afterwards stood.

Putting all this together, we may conclude that the original Jerusalem occupied the Temple-hill; that its patronal deity was Salim or Sulmanu, who was addressed as 'the Most High god'; that Salim was associated with a 'Baal' whose temple stood in a neighbouring town, and who was already known as both Yau (Yeho) and Yautu or Yahweh (IP and NIN-IP) before the Israelitish conquest of Canaan; and that the Old Testament is right when it says (Gn 4²⁶) that the name of Yahweh was known even in the antediluvian age. As at Shêkh Baraqât, Salim and Yau would have formed a triad along with the goddess Asherah—whatever the exact title of the latter may have been at Jerusalem,—the triad of the mother-goddess, who was identified with the earth on which the city stood, the father-god and the son-god, being one of the religious conceptions which the Western Semites owed to Hittite influence. The displacement of Salim and Asherah by Yahweh was a sign of Jewish conquest and the triumph of Jewish monotheism.

Contributions and Comments.

A Fifth Greek Testament.

IT seems a pious duty towards a well-deserving worker to add to the 'four editions of the Greek Testament' mentioned on p. 170 a fifth one—*The Resultant Greek Testament*, by the late Richard Francis Weymouth (1822–1902); third edition, London: James Clarke & Co., 1905.

Maulbronn.

EB. NESTLE.

Genesis xxi. 22.

SKINNER remarks: 'G ἐσκίπτων (the same word as Lk 1^{41.44}), perhaps confusing רון, "run," with רצן, "break."'

The same remark is found in Gunkel from the first to the third edition. Ball in Haupt's *S.B.O.T.* and Kittel in his *B.H.* have no remark.

Now it is clear that G did not think of רון, but of רצן, which is in Aramaic the regular equivalent for σκίπτων; compare the Peshito of Lk 1^{41.44}, and Σκίπτος as Greek name of the river רצן of Edessa (cf. Bar-desanes). In Hebrew it occurs only in Job 41¹⁴, where G reads רון. Jerome had already remarked that the Septuagint frequently followed Aramaic usage, instead of Hebrew (*non hebraicum sermonem exposuerunt, sed syrum*, in Ec 1); see Swete, *Introduction*, p. 319. The question is of importance because of the connexion with Lk 1⁴¹. In which circles did the latter narrative originate? in circles acquainted with Greek and the Septuagint, or in those acquainted with Hebrew and Aramaic?

Maulbronn.

EB. NESTLE.

An alleged Marginal Reading of the Revisers.

THE Clarendon Press has presented us with a new edition of the Greek Testament, giving the text supposed to underlie the Revised Version, together with a critical apparatus, the latter prepared by Alexander Souter. About the apparatus I do not intend to speak here; so far as I have seen yet, it seems to be a most careful and useful

piece of work. But since in the Greek Testament which I had the honour to prepare for the B.F.B.S. in connexion with its Centenary, I went over the same ground, giving in the apparatus the readings supposed to underlie the R.V., I naturally compared the new edition at once with my own, to see whether I might derive some benefit from the new work. When I came to Mt 22³⁸ I found in Souter an alleged marginal reading, πρώτη κα μεγάλη, which is not in my notes. Looking closely into the matter, I see that it is a *mistake of Palmer's* (1881), which I discovered on the 21st February 1905, and at that time communicated to the Clarendon Press. I have still the memorandum from the Secretary to the Delegates (*L.B.* 420, 28th February 1905) acknowledging the receipt of my letter, and saying that it would receive attention. It seems not to have received this attention, and thus it happens that a variant, and with it a letter of the alphabet, must be removed from the new book, as the evidence of an oversight which was not corrected at the right time.

Vice versa I miss in Souter Mt 11²⁸ καταβασθήσῃ for the marginal reading, 'be brought down' (comp. Lk 10¹⁵). There are other passages where my apparatus about the R.V. is fuller than Souter's, e.g. Mt 3¹⁷ 5²² 16⁷ 26⁴¹ (comp. Souter at Mk 14³⁸); and some few where we disagree, especially in spelling and punctuation. Compare the shortest verse in the Greek Testament, Lk 20³⁰: Souter's *comma* after δεύτερος gives the impression that he agrees with Westcott-Hort 'and the second and the third took her,' while the R.V. with its colon—according to my opinion—wishes us to read: 'and the first took a wife, and died childless; and the second;' *sc.* died childless after having taken her. This is not the time or place to go into further details; but it would be of interest if any one could tell how this mistake at Mt 22³⁸ might arise.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Ἰουδαίων in Acts ii. 9.

Ἰουδαίων in Ac 2⁹ is an old *crux interpretum*, and many attempts have been made to solve the diffi-

culty. Some time ago I suggested that, as a Jewish writer has said, the expression אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל might be the same as Palestine, and Professor Samuel Krauss of Vienna gives in the *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, 1910, p. 225, testimony from the Talmudic literature that אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל sometimes means Mesopotamia or a portion of Mesopotamia. Professor Krauss says that the simplest solution of all the difficulties of this passage would be to state that 'Ioudaia' is here the same as a portion of Mesopotamia. Very simple, indeed. But is that to be the final 'solution' of the *crux*?

LUDWIG KÖHLER.

Langnau, Zurich.

The Parousia of Christ.

I TRUST I shall not be thought captious if I venture to point out that recent discovery would appear to necessitate a modification of the point of view adopted from Dr. Horton on p. 114 in the admirable Advent Sermon of the December number. It is there stated that *Parousia* means 'presence' and 'coming,' but with the centre of gravity in the idea of *presence* rather than *coming*. Professor Deissmann's *Light from the Ancient East*, however, has now made it clear that precisely the reverse is correct. *Parousia* is a technical term in the papyri for a royal or official visit, and the Latin equivalent is *adventus* (pp. 372-379). This is of great importance to those who cherish the New Testament aspect of the 'happy hope' (Tit 2¹³), in which not only Christ's 'presence' but His 'coming' is expected. HARRINGTON C. LEES.

Beckenham.

Note on Matthew v. 39.

IN commenting on this verse most interpreters remark on the unlikelihood of a person striking an opponent on the 'right' cheek, rather on the left, *i.e.*, with the right hand. But it appears to me that this difficulty is entirely removed, and our Lord's meaning brought out with greater power if we simply imagine the blow to be *struck from behind*. In that case the injury would wear a cowardly and exasperating character, and force the person struck to *turn round* immediately with his blood up and eager to retaliate. Instead of

allowing the natural emotion to overmaster him he holds his hand, and silently stands presenting to his enemy 'the other also,' to be struck by the same hand.

W. HOPE DAVISON.

Bolton, Lancs.

Sumerian Administrative Documents.¹

SEVERAL important discussions are found in the introductory part of this volume. The chief of these relates to the place in history of the Second Dynasty of Ur. The total elimination from the chronology of the so-called Second Babylonian Dynasty is not conceded, but it is held that between the first and third dynasties an interval of 177 years remains to be accounted for. In this connexion stress is laid upon the Hittite conquest of Babylon and its results. This was no mere marauding expedition. What the Hittites conquered they kept, at least for some time. Hence an interval elapsed before the Kassite occupation (Third Dynasty). Without indicating all the stages in the proof, it may be said that the reign of Hammurabi is placed *c.* 2045-2003 B.C., the beginning of the First Babylonian Dynasty *c.* 2147, and the beginning of the Second Dynasty of Ur *c.* 2408. The kings are:—

Ur-Engur	2408-2390 B.C.
Dungi	2390-2332 B.C.
Bur-Sin	2332-2323 B.C.
Gimil-Sin	2323-2316 B.C.
Ibi-Sin	2316-2291 B.C.

Of 171 tablets here given, 115 are dated, most of them in the reigns of Dungi, Bur-Sin, and Gimil-Sin. Exhaustive lists of dates, certain and uncertain, are appended to this section, exhibiting clearly the system of dating by the important event of each year, which was the practice of that age.

Myhrman is in full agreement with Pinches that 'there is still much to learn concerning the calendar of this early period.' He brings to light

¹ 'Sumerian Administrative Documents dated in the reigns of the Kings of the Second Dynasty of Ur, from the Temple Archives of Nippur,' by David W. Myhrman, Docent of Semitic Languages at the University of Uppsala. *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*, Series A; Cuneiform Texts, vol. iii. Part I.; xii. 146 pp.; plates 70, xii. Philadelphia, 1910. \$6.00.

the fact that at least *four different nomenclatures* of the months were used at the same time within this period, and while the order of the months in the several lists is known, it is not certain which is the first month of the year. A provisional harmony of the various systems is included (p. 51).

From a collection varied in character a judicious selection of specimen tablets, with transcription and translation, has been made. The tablets so treated number 24, and relate to court proceedings, bonds, promissory notes, purchase and sale, receipts, inventories, cost of cultivation of fields, expenditure of grain, flour, and wool. As in other departments of the study the tentative nature of the interpretation given is emphasized.

The result of the investigation is in the main very satisfactory. The cuneiform section leaves nothing to be desired, while the two lists of signs prefixed to this part are most helpful. The indexes are comparatively free from mistakes. Unfortunately the same cannot be said of chap. 4 ('The Subject-Matter') and chap. 5 ('Dates'), where many corrections in figures require to be made. The same remark applies to chap. 8 ('Transcription and Translation of Specimen Tablets'). Two instances may be cited. A unique tablet (No. 75) giving the account of a Date Harvest has, in l. 7, 22 trees instead of 12, and a total of 44 *gur* of dates instead of 54. One of these errors is evident from the transcription, the other from the photographic reproduction. No. 79 gives an account of cattle herds, four being grouped together. The total of each herd is given in passing, and a summation of the three kinds (cattle, sheep, and kids) is made at the end. No less than six corrections in figures have to be made in the transcription and translation of this tablet. Myhrman, depending unduly on a numerical system given in Hilprecht, *B.E.* xx. p. 26, attains a total of 4550 sheep, which is seen to be much too high. Accordingly the total is confined to a footnote, and the cuneiform is not translated. But the signs may be taken otherwise (cf. Assy. *nēr*=600), and then the total yielded is 786 sheep, which tallies with the tablet itself, e.g. 340 (sheep and lambs)+382 (young ones of sheep and goats)+202 (lambs and kids)=924. Total number of kids, 138, leaving 786 sheep. Wherever opportunity is given of checking the lists it may be asserted the tablets are correct.

Several obvious literary blunders have also been noted.

After all, the blemishes are surface ones, and the book, as a whole, is to be commended as a valuable addition to the excellent series in which it appears.

WILLIAM CRUICKSHANK.

Kinneff.

The Hebrew Word for 'Atone.'

THAT the notion of atonement is expressed in Hebrew by the verb *kipper* is generally agreed. But there is a question as to the concrete representation which was connected by the Hebrews with this verbal expression. Did they think of the act that effected atonement as a 'covering' or a 'wiping clean'? The former explanation was for long almost the only one that prevailed. It is represented, e.g., by Gesenius in his *Thesaurus*, and by the *Oxford Heb. Lexicon*. But in the edition of Gesenius' *Lexicon* edited by Buhl and others, the root idea assigned to *kipper* is 'wipe,' and the Heb. term is regarded as probably a loan-word from the Assyrian. Rashi, we are told, already put forward this explanation; it was preferred by Robertson Smith in his *Religion of the Semites* (cf. his *O.T.J.C.*², 381); the meaning 'wipe' is present in the Aramaic form of the word; and—last, but not least—the Assy. *pi'el*, *kuppuru*, means 'wipe.'

In proceeding to investigate the root-meaning of the word—a question of great importance in the theological sphere, and even outside it—we naturally begin with:

I. THE USAGE IN HEBREW.—(a) The construction of the verb *kipper*.—(1) We have *kipper* used with reference to the face of an injured party ('*ākappērā pānāv*, Gn 32²¹). Here the meaning is surely 'cover'='I will prevent the injured party from beholding the cause of offence.' This sense is confirmed by other Heb. forms of expression; e.g. the verb *kissā*, which beyond all question means 'cover,' is employed in Job 9²⁴, 'The earth is given into the hands of the wicked, he covereth the eyes of its judges.' This can mean only 'he keeps their eyes closed.' (2) *Kipper* is construed with the preposition '*al*' ('over') followed by the word for 'sin' (Jer 18²³ etc.). Here the meaning 'wipe' is impossible, the only sense must be that of covering the sin so that it may not present a provocative aspect to the eyes of a holy

God. (3) So, when *kipper* 'al is spoken of a sinner (Ex 30¹⁵), what can be meant but 'cover the sinner from the Divine justice which he has challenged'? (4) The same interpretation must be accepted when *kipper* 'al is used of an object that has been polluted (Ex 29³⁶ etc.). (5) Specially clear is the meaning 'cover' when *kipper* is construed with the preposition *be'ad*, 'behind,' 'on behalf of' (Lv 9⁷ etc.).

The meaning 'cover' being manifestly the only legitimate one in all the five instances above enumerated, the presumption is that the same meaning is to be discovered in the passages where *kipper* is construed with the accusative, just as the verb *baka*, 'weep,' is construed sometimes with 'al ('over'), and sometimes with the accusative (Gn 23² etc.), in the sense of 'bewail.' When, for instance, in such passages as Dn 9²⁴ etc., *kipper* is construed with the accusative of the sin, not only does the rendering 'cover the sin (that it may not displease the eye of a holy God)' yield a perfectly good sense, but the meaning 'wipe' must be transformed into that of 'wipe away,' if it is to suit the object 'sin.' But Hebrew had at its disposal another word, namely, *māḥā*, to express the idea of 'wipe away' or 'destroy.'

(b) Our conclusion that *kipper* means 'cover' = 'atone' (or render ineffective) is strengthened by analogies in the linguistic usage of the Hebrews. We have already noted the employment of *kissā*, 'cover,' in Job 9²⁴, where its object is the eyes of a judge. But *kissā* is also connected with 'sin' as its object (Ps 85³ and Neh 3³⁷, cf. also Pr 10¹²). We also find *kesūy*, 'one who is covered in respect of sin' (Ps 32¹). All this is clear evidence of the extent to which this conception was current amongst the Hebrews. Another indication to the same effect is present in Gn 20¹⁶, where we hear of a covering of the eyes, which is to keep off offensive glances.

(c) The same meaning of 'cover' for *kipper* is embodied in the rites where blood is employed as the medium of atonement. The application of blood (the supposed seat of the soul or life) to the altar is designed by God 'to cover the soul of the sinner' (Lv 17¹¹); on the occasion of the burnt-offering the blood is dashed (*zarak*) about the altar; in the sin-offering it is sprinkled (*hizza*), partly on the horns of the altar, and partly towards the inner curtain or on the lid of the ark. Do these operations more resemble a 'covering' or a

'wiping'? Are they not the exact opposite of the latter?

(d) Although what has been said is sufficient to establish 'cover' as the meaning of *kipper*, we may mention some additional evidences. There is the word *kappōreth*, which in view of the order in Ex 25^{16f. 21a,b}—the filling up of the ark and its covering—was originally and properly a designation for the lid of the ark. Again, *kēphōr*, 'hoarfrost,' means in all probability 'covering (of the ground)'; and *kāphār*, 'village,' very likely meant at first something which 'covers' a part of the land.

II. THE USAGE IN THE OTHER SEMITIC LANGUAGES.—(a) As a matter of fact, the question of what notion the Hebrews connected with the verbal stem *kpr*, does not depend upon whether the same sense is attached to similar consonantal forms in the cognate Semitic languages. There is abundant evidence that in the various languages one and the same sounds served to express different shades of meaning. For instance, we have Heb. *halak* = 'go,' but Arab. *halaka* or *halika* = 'perish.' The Heb. 'abā, 'wish,' has its counterpart in the Arab. 'aba(j) = 'refuse.' In Heb. *dabar* means 'speak,' whereas Assyr. *dabāru* = 'to be waste,' 'to lie waste' (R. F. Harper, *The Hammurabi Code*, 1904, p. 161). The Heb. *zakar*, 'remember,' stands side by side with the Assyr. *zakāru*, 'name,' 'speak.' The Arab. *khalaka*, 'measure off,' 'determine,' and *khalika*, 'to be smooth or worn out,' have their parallels in the two Hebrew words *khalak*, 'divide' and 'be smooth'; but the Assyr. *khalāqu* means 'lose,' 'destroy' (Harper, *op. cit.* 164). The Heb. *sar*, 'prince,' is not synonymous with the Assyr. *šarru*, which designates the 'king.' Hence, on the ground of extensive analogies, it might be quite possible that in the various Semitic languages quite different senses were attached to the same verbal stem *kpr*.

(b) But, as a matter of fact, Hebrew does not occupy an isolated position amongst its Semitic congeners in connecting the meaning of 'cover' with *kipper*. The same meaning belongs to the Arab. *kaphara* (cf. Lane's *Arab. Dict.*, s.v., where this sense is attested by such quotations as 'he covers the sown seed with earth,' or 'the clouds cover the heavens'). Moreover, a substantive derived from the same root stands in S. Arab. Sabæan for 'cover' or 'lid.'

(c) It is true that the Assyr. cognate to the

Heb. *kipper*, namely, *kuppuru*, bears the sense of 'wipe,' 'stroke,' as Zimmern points out in the latest edition of Gesenius-Buhl. But (1) this may be explained on the principle established above, that different shades of meaning may be developed from the same root by different Semitic languages. (2) There is probably a logical connexion between the meaning 'cover' and that of 'wipe' or 'stroke.' May not the meaning 'stroke' be the connecting link? The operation of stroking may issue in a besmearing or covering, or in a stroking out or wiping away. (3) It is readily explicable also that the same verb should bear the sense 'wipe' in Jewish Aramaic (Dalman, *Aram. u. neuheb. Wörterbuch*, 196) and in Syriac. This is simply a case like that of *mlk* in Heb. = 'to be king,' but generally in Syriac = 'advise'; or of Heb. *mana'* = 'keep back,' Syr. *mena'* = 'arrive,' 'come,' Heb. *abad* = 'serve,' Syr. *ebad* = 'make.'

III. Our conclusion, then, is that there is no reason, upon the ground of the usage of other Semitic languages, to give up the root-idea of *kipper*, which is established for Hebrew by irrefragable proofs. Nor does the appeal to Rashi alter the case. For, in the first place, his opinion does not invalidate the above arguments; and, in the second place, his words lose much of their weight when the motive is considered that led him to express his judgment. He explained Gn 32²¹, 'ākappērā pānāv as = 'I will end (*abattel*) his anger,' adding, 'It is an Aramaic expression (*lashon arammī*), and such a use of *kipper* occurs frequently in the Talmud, in connexion with the washing of the hands.' In other words, he interpreted the Heb. usage by that of the Jewish Aramaic—an unwarrantable procedure in view of the varying senses attached by different Semitic languages to the same verbal stem.

When we read, then, of atoning for sin in the O.T., there is no need to think of any root-idea except what has hitherto been accepted by O.T. science, and no new light has been shed on the matter by the Babylono-Assyrian literature.

ED. KÖNIG.

Bonn.

'Salmon.'

'A LINK in our Lord's genealogy (Mt 1^{4f}, Lk 3³² [R.Vm. *Sala*])'; that is all that *D.C.G.* ii. 551 has to say about this name.

H. A. Redpath was more explicit in *D.B.* iv. 354; read his statements.

Tischendorf was the first who introduced *Σαλα* into the text of the N.T., and this only in his last edition (1872). In his seventh he knew for this reading only B, and left *Σαλμων* in the text.¹ Then he found it attested in the Sinaiticus and the Ethiopic Version, and in Mt 1^{4.5} by the Curetonian. Since that time we have learned through Horner that it is found in Luke in two manuscripts of the Coptic Version. When the *Syriac Version of the Sinai* was found, it, too, showed *Sala*, and seemed to corroborate the decision of Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort, and B. Weiss. But the attestation goes still further: *שאלה* is the reading of the *Syriac O.T.* in Ru 4^{20.21}, where the Hebrew text has *שלם* and *שלם*. Therefore we do not longer wonder to find it in the Curetonian Syriac in Matthew, and in the Sinai Syriac in Luke (see on this point Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, ii. 203). But all the more must we ask, how did it come into the Greek text of Luke, especially if it was not there the original reading? For this is the dilemma presented by these two forms.

If *Salmon* is the original in Luke, which was the general view till Tischendorf, how did a correction which is essentially Syriac come into the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, which are generally brought into connexion with Egypt?

If, on the other hand, *Sala* is the original in Luke, *Salmon* must be a correction in all other witnesses. Now note that Luke is said to have been a Syrian of Antioch, and that also Πησα in his Genealogy points to an Aramaic source, if the suggestion is true—which appears to me very likely—that Resa goes back on ראש, 'the head,' the attribute of Zorobabel, mistaken for a proper name. (On the latter point Plummer is good, while *D.B.* and *D.C.G.* are totally reticent). We see textual criticism, 'the science of minutiae,' as it has been styled, is not devoid of interest, and can lead to important conclusions.

A sad example of how the German Revision Committee mistook its task is offered by this name: where Luther has had 'Salmon' in Luke, they printed 'Salma,' to bring it into agreement with Matthew.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

¹ I do not know through whom the reading of B first became known. Scholz (1845) gives 'Σαλα Bal.' In reality the name is accentuated Σάλα in B (p. 1310b, first line).

Entre Nous.

The Biblical World.

The Biblical World is one of the most scholarly and progressive of the magazines of America. It is also one of the most original. In the reviewing of books, as in other respects, it has its own method. That method is to select two or perhaps three out of all the books of the month, put them into the hands of specialists in their study, and then publish a review that carries weight.

In the issue for August 1910 three books are reviewed. The first is the second volume of *The Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. The reviewers are Professor John W. Moncrief and Professor Ira M. Price. In the first part of the review the volume is criticised as a whole; in the second part the Semitic articles are examined separately and minutely. This is the first part:—

A glance through the nine hundred pages of this volume reveals what the editor and his collaborators have accomplished. They have collected and organized the world's achievements to date in religion and ethics from Arthur to Bunyan. They have summarized their achievements concisely, and in the main clearly, in such English as the various writers could command. We might suppose them to have had distinctly in mind several classes of persons such as: (1) the general reader of average intelligence and equipment; (2) the professional man—especially the clergyman, the literary man, and the lawyer—whose range of information must be wide and accurate, but easily accessible; (3) the student at the beginning of his researches. The volume introduces him to his subject, shows him in brief what has already been done, enables him to see where original research may begin, and puts him into connexion with the best sources of information; (4) the scholars and specialists who need for constant reference an epitome of knowledge on subjects cognate to their own studies.

A more careful examination of numerous articles shows that these ends have been reached about as well as possible in our times when things are moving so swiftly that knowledge to-day is sure to be discredited in part or in whole to-morrow. Yet in the whirl of events some matters are getting settled in broad outlines at least, and the methods according to which investigations are to proceed are becoming somewhat sharply defined. We

accordingly do not believe that this encyclopædia will very soon be entirely out of date.

In our opinion the editor has all in all been fortunate in the selection of his helpers. The radical, the conservative, and the *via media* man all appear in his list. But the scholarship and recognized ability of each one is not likely to be called in question. The subject with which he deals is one which he is competent to treat, and he understands that he is in the rather fierce limelight, and this is sufficient to make most men circumspect. There are undoubtedly difficulties inherent in this mode of procedure, but its alternative of selecting writers substantially agreed in their theories would have made the encyclopædia a one-sided affair, and thus, to say the least, have deprived it of the highest scientific value.

We note, too, with extreme pleasure that the editor has fully acted upon the principle at last generally recognized, that history is fundamental in the procedure of all the great disciplines. Thus each important subject appears in the full light of its history. This feature of the method is sure to lend additional permanence to the different articles so treated.

We observe, moreover, that the editor gives us much more than the title seems at first sight to promise—*An Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. For example, we have articles on 'Biology,' 'Brain and Mind,' 'Biogenesis,' 'Atomic Theory.' The article on 'Being' is metaphysical, and Professor Royce's article on 'Axioms' is a logical or philosophical statement. We are interested at the end when he says: 'Axioms, in the language of modern theory, are best defined, neither as certainties nor as absolute principles, but as those principles which are used as the first in a special theory.' We do not, however, here make an adverse criticism, but rather call attention to the infinite vastness of the ramifications of religion into all knowledge and to show how incomplete the work would have been without such articles as we have mentioned.

Many of the articles are so long as to make elaborate essays, indeed, in some cases, small treatises, embracing the best work of several specialists. For example, the article on 'Asceticism' contains approximately 63,000 words, and is the work of twelve contributors. The subject is

handled in all its important phases. Or, again, take the article on 'Baptism.' It contains more than 60,000 words, and is the co-operative work of nine specialists. It discusses ethnic baptism, baptism in the New Testament, baptism in the early Church, in the later Church; baptism among the Greeks and Romans, the Hindus, the Muhammadans, the Polynesians, and the Teutons. The part that is sure to be most instructive to the majority of readers is that on ethnic baptism. This is true because it opens up a new continent to the generality of students of the subject. Among very many peoples there was a rite similar to baptism performed either in infancy or at a later period of life. 'Sometimes that likeness is only on the surface; in other cases it extends deeper, and the pagan rite has also a religious and ethical purpose. The use of water in such a ceremony is connected with a more general ceremonial use among heathen races as a means of ritual purification.' Water was the most natural agency for cleansing and purifying, and so water was used for the removal of *tabu*. Water became a safeguard. The animistic theory gave life to water. In the Hebrew Scriptures we meet the expression 'living water.' We also find various beliefs about 'The Water of Life' conferring immortality, strength, beauty, or about the fountain of youth, idealized in folk-lore, in many European folk-tales with parallels from all stages of barbaric and savage culture. Juvenal satirizes the superstitious Roman for 'washing away his sins by dipping his head three times in the waters of the Tiber.' In many regions are found striking analogies to Christian baptism. And so in a most interesting manner new light from a great variety of sources is thrown upon this central ordinance of the Church.

If the succeeding volumes hold up to the present standard the completed work will go far toward an ideal—unattainable, but valuable as an ideal—which we have recently seen expressed as follows:

I am not man till in my single guise
All that on earth hath ever been is told;
I must life's whole experiences hold;
The race itself I must epitomize.

Some Poetry Old and New.

To begin with an old book on an older, Messrs. Dent have published an edition of *Blake's Vision*

of the *Book of Job* (6s. net), with an Introduction and Notes by Mr. Joseph H. Wicksteed, M.A. It is a volume that will open a new world of ideas, a new spiritual world, to the diligent sympathetic reader. It may be that the reader has already entered on his inheritance in the Book of Job by the means of William Blake's interpretation thereof. It may be that he has not. Mr. Wicksteed, reproducing the engravings on a reduced scale, does not desire to substitute his own for Blake's engravings; nor would he, while entering into the secret chamber of this man's innocent imagery, hinder us from entering but rather invite us to enter with him, heartily acknowledging that he himself can go only a little way yet. There are things in Job which Blake did not apprehend; there are things in Blake which Mr. Wicksteed cannot altogether comprehend. But with Mr. Wicksteed as most sincere guide we enter, as it has been said, on a new spiritual realm. Mr. Wicksteed does especially help us to use the tools. And without an easy use of the tools—figures, symbols, lines, curves, contractions—we can make little of Blake. Above all he shows us how to interpret Blake by Blake. It is therefore more than a new edition, it is a new vision.

Another Blake. This is the *Songs of Innocence*, with a preface by Thomas Seecombe, and twelve coloured illustrations by Honor C. Appleton (Herbert & Daniel; 5s. net). The page is a moderate quarto, large white paper, marginal device of alternate blue and red, and art canvas for the binding. The illustrations are in soft warm colours. Their conception of the child life is not to be criticized; it *is* the child life.

In Mr. Hilaire Belloc's new volume of *Verses* (Duckworth; 6s.) there is nothing finer than the Christmas carol on page 12. *Could* anything be finer? But read it as it should be read.

NOËL.

I.

On a winter's night long time ago
(*The bells ring loud and the bells ring low*),
When high howled wind, and down fell snow
(*Carillon, Carilla*).
Saint Joseph he and Nostre Dame,
Riding on an ass, full weary came
From Nazareth into Bethlehem.
And the small child Jesus smile on you.

II.

And Bethlehem inn they stood before
 (*The bells ring less and the bells ring more*),
 The landlord bade them begone from his door
 (Carillon, Carilla).
 'Poor folk' (says he) 'must lie where they may,
 For the Duke of Jewry comes this way,
 With all his train on a Christmas Day.'
 And the small child Jesus smile on you.

III.

Poor folk that may my carol hear
 (*The bells ring single and the bells ring clear*),
 See! God's one child had hardest cheer!
 (Carillon, Carilla).
 Men grown hard on a Christmas morn;
 The dumb beast by and a babe forlorn.
 It was very, very cold when our Lord was born.
 And the small child Jesus smile on you.

IV.

Now these were Jews as Jews must be
 (*The bells ring merry and the bells ring free*).
 But Christian men in a band are we
 (Carillon, Carilla).
 Empty we go, and ill be-dight,
 Singing Noël on a Winter's night.
 Give us to sup by the warm firelight,
 And the small child Jesus smile on you.

Messrs. Smith, Elder, & Co. have issued a complete edition of *The Poetical Works of Mrs. Horace Dobell* (10s. 6d. net). Mrs. Dobell had much facility of production. This is a volume of 810 pages, printed in small type and double column. It cannot be said that the facility was in the use of words; for while there is no sign of struggle for expression, there is nowhere easy flow of language to soothe the sense of hearing. The ease is due to the writer's pleasure in average everyday thinking. She wrote what others speak. She wrote in verse what we usually find written in prose in the newspapers. If there is a weakness in the work, it is not that the language does not suit the idea, it is rather that the idea sometimes follows the language. If there is anywhere unaccustomed strength in it, the strength comes from the excellence of the intention. Take these two verses.

TO A CALUMNIATOR OF THE DEAD.

Oh! if thou can'st not speak well of the dead,
 It might be sometimes well that voice were still!
 No word of falsehood ever need be said,
 Yet harm comes from thy constant tales of ill!

The dead go where they will be judged, and we
 Are stamped with vile conceit and pride, to deem
 We gauge the depth of all we hear and see,
 As if all things in life are what they *seem*!

Mr. Henry Frowde of the Oxford University Press has published *Poems of Clough* (2s. 6d. net). The edition, which has all the outward charm of Mr. Frowde's almost inimitable work, includes 'Ambarvalia,' both versions of 'the Bothie,' and 'Amours de Voyage.'

A new and cheaper edition of *Hymns of the Greek Church*, as translated, with introduction and notes, by the Rev. John Brownlie, D.D., has been published by Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier (1s. 6d. net).

It is a fine proof of the possibility of uniting literature with devotion that a new *Book of Sacred Verse* can be gathered from English literature without repeating all the poems that have appeared in other collections. The new gathering is the work of Professor W. A. Knight, Emeritus Professor of Philosophy in the University of St. Andrews. Professor Knight has the instinct that cannot err, the instinct for the poetical. He even dares once to quote a poem in Latin. It is a verse found in a book of devotions written by Mary Queen of Scots, just before her execution.

O Domine Deus! speravi in Te:

O care mi Jesu! nunc libera me.

In dura catena, in misera poena,

Desidero Te.

Languendo, querendo, et genuflectendo,

Adoro, imploro, ut liberer me!

Professor Knight is also a scholar, accurate and industrious. And so we wonder that in quoting Kethe's version of the Hundredth Psalm, he quotes the line—

We are His flock, He doth us feed,
 instead of

We are His folk, He doth us feed.

Messrs. Dent also publish *Sabbath Thoughts*, by Elizabeth Livingston (2s. 6d. net). For the most part the poems are paraphrases of great passages of Scripture.

A hard-working city surgeon, Mr. John W. Taylor, worked hard also at the making of poetry. And he made it. For it cannot be done without

hard work. The most characteristic of his collected poems—the title is *The Doorkeeper* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net)—is one that was written on Hungerford Footbridge at three o'clock in the morning.

My heart a solemn vigil keeps
With unknown souls;
Their touch upon me tingles and creeps,
Their warm breath rolls

About me: their outstretched hands I see
Before, behind,
And lonely voices are calling me
On every wind:

O sorrow-laden hearts, whose throbs
Of sad unrest,
O lives whose tears and bitter sobs
Are all unguessed—

Come, take my hands: could you but know
My longing heart,
Opprest with tears that wait to flow
Pride would not part

Our souls, nor subtle doubt which bars
The love that seeks,
And here, beneath the patient stars,
Feels, yearns, and speaks:—

God help me! in the crowd that grows
My voice is lost,
Distorting shadows hide me from those
Who need me most!

Two anthologies of the Seasons have been published at one and the same time. Mr. George Allen's claims attention first. It is in four separate volumes entitled *The Book of Spring*, *The Book of Summer*, *The Book of Autumn*, and *The Book of Winter* (1s. 6d. net each). It deserves attention first because of the illustrations by Margaret W. Tarrant, which are in colour, and most sympathetically in harmony with the season. In each volume there are four such illustrations besides the design on the cover.

One of the poems quoted in the book just mentioned is 'Pippa's Song' from Browning. 'Pippa's Song' is quoted also in Messrs. Williams & Norgate's anthology, of which the title is simply *The Seasons* (3s. 6d. net). It was inevitable that 'Pippa's Song' should be quoted in both; it seems also to be inevitable that it should be misquoted. For editors, as well as preachers, will persist in quoting familiar passages from memory,

and we have not met the preacher or editor yet who could quote from memory ten lines of the most familiar poetry quite correctly. But *The Seasons* is a very fine anthology. 'The Barrel Organ,' by Alfred Noyes, with which it opens, is enough to give distinction to any book.

The Story of the Glory is a dangerous title for any kind of book, an alarming title for a book of poems. But it is descriptive. For whatever can be said about Mr. J. Boyd's poetry, the volume does undoubtedly contain, as the editor claims, 'a body of sound and healthful doctrine' (Morgan & Scott; 6s.).

But the doctrine in Mr. Percy C. Ainsworth's *Poems and Sonnets* (Kelly; 2s. 6d. net) is just as sound and healthful, and the poetry is poetry. Take the last sonnet of all in evidence.

There lives a glory in these sweet June days
Such as I found not in the years gone by,
A kindlier meaning in the unclouded sky,
A tenderer whisper in the woodland ways;
And I have understanding of the lays
The birds are singing, forasmuch as I
Have learned how love avails to satisfy
A man's whole heart, and fills his lips with praise.

The morning air is laden with the scent
Of roses; and within my garden grows
A rosebud that shall some day be a rose,
Whose bloom and perfume never shall be spent—
The flower of love: and he who hath it knows
The endless summer of complete content.

There is no American poetess or poet more popular in England at present than Ella Wheeler Wilcox, and Messrs. Gay & Hancock are wise to take the tide while it serves. They publish her in many forms, one of the most attractive being a series of four little volumes entitled 'Gems from Wilcox' (1s. net each). The latest issue, however, is the *Poems of Experience* (1s. net). We wish Miss Wilcox were as sure in her ethical as in her poetical touch. The poems in this volume on 'An Episode' and 'At Bay' would then have been omitted.

The Rev. S. C. Lowry, M.A., Vicar of St. Augustin's, Bournemouth, is content to supply the magazines with verse. But his gift is greater than that of the ordinary magazine verse maker. And he has done an acceptable thing in publishing

his *Hymns and Spiritual Songs* in book form (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net).

Mr. Charles Moss, anxious to impress upon us the importance of the place occupied by angels in the Bible, has written a book entitled *Bible Angels*, in which he versifies every incident in which the angels play a part, and every passage in which they prominently appear (Routledge; 5s. net).

Mrs. Schuyler van Rensselaer is a true poet. Her *Poems* are published by Messrs. Macmillan (5s. net). To prove that she is a true poet we shall quote two of the shortest poems in the book.

THE CUP AND THE WINE.

Brief, cried the Psalmist, is the total span
Of the brief days that build the life of man.
—Ay, royal singer on Judæan hills,
The cup is narrow; but the wine that fills
The cup may mean an ocean in its rim.
A thousand years are as a day to Him
Who pours our draughts of joy and tears:
To us a day may be a thousand years.

AN EPITAPH.

For love and joy to Life I prayed;
An empty hand he stretched to me;
And when I turned to Death for aid,
He passed me by and would not see.

But Life repented him and gave
All I had ever asked and more.
Then Death in haste bestowed this grave
Some broken heart was pleading for.

'The discovery by Mr. Bertram Dobell ten years ago of the poems of Thomas Traherne was one of the most striking literary sensations of recent times; and although Mr. Dobell's estimate of Traherne's poetical merits was far too high, it would doubtless be admitted by all that the publication of the poems (to say nothing of the still more notable *Centuries of Meditations*) has made a real addition to English literature. Traherne is a writer of such interest and originality that any facts throwing light on his history, intellectual development, or methods of work, and especially any additions to his literary remains, are to be welcomed. Such an addition is made by the present volume, which contains not only a

considerably altered text of various poems found in Mr. Dobell's edition, but also thirty-eight hitherto unpublished poems.'

Thus begins Mr. Bell's introduction to the Clarendon Press edition of *Traherne's Poems of Felicity* (5s. net). Never did the great press issue a more pleasing volume. The text of the poems is as nearly a facsimile of the manuscript as the printed page can make it. And the paper and binding are of the best.

Mr. Fisher Unwin was happily directed to an editor for his *Book of Scottish Poetry* (7s. 6d. net). And the editor, Sir George Douglas, Bart., has been altogether inspired to take and reject as he has done. Not that a Scot, especially a northern Scot, does not miss a favourite here and there. That was inevitable if the book was to be kept within these present limits. What is, however, equally important with the choice, Sir George Douglas has used good common sense in the use of his texts. For the ballads he has gone to Scott. This is his vindication: 'Though certainly not the most scientific, he ventures notwithstanding to consider Scott's version (the Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border) beyond comparison the best. For the acknowledged liberties taken with the text are the liberties of a man of genius, and of a genius, too, who was marvellously akin to, or in sympathy with, the original authors of the poems.'

The anthology is not ended without including the editor himself, John Davidson, Charles Murray, Douglas Ainslie, Lauchlan Maclean Watt, Will H. Ogilvie, Lord Alfred Douglas, John Hogben, and Maria Stuart. This is the contribution which John Hogben makes—

It is nor storm nor calm, but yesterday
The wild winds swept in sudden thunder down;
Shook the dark waters into starry spray,
And thrilled the soul of many a seaside town.
Ah, cruel are the hungry tides that drown!
They kill, yet cast ashore their tender prey;
Tossing it carelessly as seaweed brown,—
Heedless of lovers young and parents grey.

But now remorse is here! The ponderous wave
Upcoils full wearily its snowy crest,—
Of after-brooding, not of Passion, slave!—
Lit by the low slant yellow of the West.
Unquiet grave! Thyself without a grave,
Till there be no more sea,—in foam,—at rest!

Offer of Prizes.

Eight prizes are offered as follows:—

For the best anecdote illustrating any text of Scripture—

1. From Biography.
2. From History.
3. From Personal Experience.

For the best illustration, not an anecdote, of any text of Scripture—

4. From Nature or Science.
5. From Art or Industry.
6. From Human Life.
7. From Literature.

8. For the best illustration in verse of any text of Scripture.

In every case the source of the illustration must be stated fully (author, vol., page) and the quotation must be made exactly.

These eight prizes will be awarded in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June 1911 for illustrations received before the 10th of April.

The prizes offered are—

Any volume of the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, together with the right to purchase the rest of the volumes at a quarter less than the published price, namely, 2rs. instead of 28s. net.

Or—

Any four volumes of the *Great Texts of the Bible*.

Or—

Either volume of the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*.

Or—

The single-volume *Dictionary of the Bible*.

Or—

Any four volumes of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series.

Or—

Any two volumes of the 'International Theological Library' or of the 'International Critical Commentary.'

Those who send illustrations should say which offer they prefer if successful. Those who send more than one illustration should name more than one volume or set of volumes in case they should be awarded more than one prize.

Initials only, or *nom de plume*, will be given in the report if that is preferred.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustrations this month have been found by the Rev. C. T. Rae, Bradford, to whom a copy of Forrest's *Authority of Christ* will be sent, and the Rev. E. J. Roberts, Melbourne, Derby, to whom a copy of Skinner's *Genesis* will be sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for March must be received by the 1st of February. The text is Ps 16¹¹.

The Great Text for April is Ps 23¹:

'The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want.'

A copy of the new edition of Walker's *The Cross and the Kingdom*, or Canon Cooke's *Progress of Revelation*, or Macgregor's *Some of God's Ministries*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for May is Ps 37⁷:

'Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for him.'

A copy of Canon Cooke's *Progress of Revelation*, or of Dr. Richard's *New Testament of Higher Buddhism*, or of Dr. Homes Dudden's *Christ and Christ's Religion*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for June is Ps 51¹⁷:

'The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit:

A broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.'

A copy of Skinner's *Genesis*, or Richard's *New Testament of Higher Buddhism*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for July is Ps 68¹⁸:

'Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led thy captivity captive;

Thou hast received gifts among men,

Yea, among the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell with them.'

A copy of any volume of the 'Great Texts of the Bible,' or of the 'International Theological Library,' will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.